CIVIL JUSTICE REFORM ACT

PLAN

DECEMBER 1, 1993

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

CIVIL JUSTICE REFORM ACT PLAN

Signed into law on December 1, 1990, the Civil Justice Reform Act (CJRA) mandated, for the first time in history, a national strategy intended to reduce the problems of cost and delay of civil litigation in United States District Courts. The act provides a mechanism, supported by the force of law, for maintaining a continuing national review of court procedures, involving the entire community of judges, lawyers, and court users. Each of the 94 United States District Courts was required to establish a local advisory Group on Litigation Cost and Delay to study the business of the courts and to make recommendations for reducing civil litigation cost and delay.

Pursuant to the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990, then Chief Judge Thomas G. Hull appointed an Advisory Group on Litigation Cost and Delay for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. The group consisted of 19 legal professionals and two business professionals with litigation experience.

The Advisory Group (AG) met throughout 1991 and 1992 both as a group and as seven separate committees. The committees concentrated on Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), Complex Litigation and Judicial Management, the Criminal Docket, Differential Case Management (DCM), Discovery, Education, and Motion Practice.

After consideration of the recommendations of the Advisory Group appointed pursuant to the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990, the United States District Court for the Eastern District

of Tennessee adopts the following Expense and Delay Reduction Plan ("Plan")[1]. The Plan is intended to address the principal causes of cost and delay within the district identified in the Advisory Group's report: court procedures, the ways in which litigants and their attorneys approach and conduct litigation, and the failure to assess the impact of new legislation on the court, and the failure to fill the district's judicial vacancy.

I. THE PLAN

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee adopts the following Expense and Delay Reduction Plan to address the conditions of the Court's civil and criminal dockets and the recommendations of the Advisory Group on Litigation Cost and Delay.

A. Judicial Vacancy. The Court makes the following recommendation to deal with the principal cause of cost and delay identified in Section II(C)(1) of the Advisory Group's report, the failure to fill the judicial vacancy within the district:

> Congress and the Executive should fill the district's existing judicial vacancy at once and should establish and act upon written, defined time limits in filling this and other judicial vacancies without the delay that has so often characterized judicial appointments within this district. [Advisory Group Recommendation III(A), Report p.51]

[1]The Court's acceptance or rejection of Advisory Group recommendations is found in Appendix I attached to this plan.

B. Cost and Delay Primarily Related to Court Procedures. Section II(C)(2) of the Advisory Group's report identifies four principal causes of cost and delay that stem, at least in part, from court practices and procedures: (a) inadequate case management, (b) resetting of trial dates, (c) motion practice, and (d) the manner in which magistrate judges are utilized. To address these causes of cost and delay, the Court has promulgated the following new local rules and adopted the following new operating procedures.

1. New Local Rules. Simultaneously with the adoption of this Plan, the Court has issued notice of its intention to adopt the following local rules pursuant to Rule 83 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The rules shall be effective on March, 1994.

a. Local Rule 7.1. Motion Practice

(a) Briefing Schedule. Unless the court notifies the parties to the contrary, briefing schedule for all motions shall be: (1) the opening brief and any accompanying affidavits or other supporting material shall be served and filed with the motion; (2) the answering brief and any accompanying affidavits or other material shall be served and filed no later than 10 days after the service of the opening brief, except that parties shall have 20 days in which to respond to dispositive motions; (3) any reply brief and accompanying material shall be served and filed no later than 5 days after the service of the answering brief. The above briefing schedule may be set aside if, ordered by the Court or within 10 days after the filing of a motion, a stipulated briefing schedule is approved by the court.

(b) Brief Format. Briefs shall include a concise statement of the factual and legal

grounds which justify the ruling sought from the court. Briefs shall comply with the format requirements of Local Rule 5.1 and shall not exceed 25 pages in length unless otherwise ordered by the court. This page limitation shall also apply to all briefs filed in bankruptcy appeals, in accordance with Bankruptcy Rule 8010(c).

(c) Reply Briefs. Unless otherwise stated by the court, reply briefs are not necessary and are not required by the court. A reply brief shall not be used to reargue the points and authorities included in the opening brief, but shall directly reply to the points and authorities contained in the answering brief.

(d) Supplemental Briefs. No additional briefs, affidavits, or other papers in support of or in opposition to a motion shall be filed without prior approval of the court, except that a party may file a supplemental brief of no more than five pages to call to the court's attention developments occurring after a party's final brief is filed. Any response to a supplemental brief shall be filed within five days after service of the supplemental brief and shall be limited to no more than five pages.

b. Local Rule 7.3. Duty to Meet and Confer Concerning Motions

All non-dispositive motions shall be accompanied by a certificate signed by counsel affirming that, after consultation between the parties to the motion, they are unable to reach an accord. The certificate must contain the names of counsel and parties appearing pro se participating and the manner of consultation. The

burden will be on counsel or the party filing the motion to initiate a conference attempting to resolve the motion informally. Failure to file an accompanying certificate of consultation may be deemed good grounds for denying any non-dispositive motion.

c. Local Rule 7.5. Resolution of Dispositive Motions by Magistrate Judge.

(a) With the imprimatur of the District Judge to whom the case is assigned, the parties to a dispositive motion may consent to the final resolution and entry of judgment on the dispositive motion by a magistrate judge.

(b) Final Rulings by Magistrate Judge. If all parties consent to a final ruling on the motion by a magistrate judge and one is available to hear the motion, the motion will be heard by a magistrate judge pursuant to 28 USC § 636(c)(1). Unless the parties specify otherwise in their consent to the exercise of jurisdiction by the magistrate judge, any appeal shall be to the court of appeals pursuant to 28 USC § 636(c)(4). Consent to a final ruling on a dispositive motion by a magistrate judge does not waive any party's right to have other matters heard by a district judge.

d. Local Rule 12.1. Extensions of Time to Respond or Plead

(a) If all counsel agree, parties shall be entitled to twenty-day initial extension of time in which to respond to the complaint, to a cross-claim, or to a

counterclaim. Counsel seeking the extension shall inform the court of agreement between counsel by sending a stipulation to the Clerk's Office and a copy of this stipulation to all other counsel in the case. No order is necessary for an initial extension of time, but any extension of time beyond an initial extension shall not be allowed except by order of the court.

(b) The court may, in its discretion, require that a written, signed certification be returned to the court verifying that counsel has communicated with his or her client and the client was made aware of the ramifications of the request for delay.

e. Local Rule 16.1. Pretrial Orders and Conferences in Civil Actions

(a) Pretrial Orders and Conferences In accordance with Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the district judge or magistrate judge assigned to the case will ensure that Rule 16(b), F.R.Civ.P., is complied with and that by means of a scheduling conference, telephone, mail or other suitable means a scheduling order is entered as soon as is practicable but in no event more than 120 days after the complaint has been served on a defendant, except in the following classes of cases:

(1) Social Security cases;

(2) Petitions for relief under 28 USC § 2254 and 2255;

(3) Actions brought under 42 USC § 1983 in which the plaintiff is pro se and is in the custody of either state or federal authorities;

(4) bankruptcy appeals.

(b) Authority of Counsel and Parties. At all pretrial conferences, each party who is not proceeding pro se shall be represented by an attorney who has the authority to bind that party regarding all matters identified by the court for discussion at the conference and all reasonably related matters. If settlement will be discussed at a pretrial conference, the court may require that the parties or party representatives with full settlement authority be present at the pretrial conference or be available by telephone.

(c) Rule 16(b) Scheduling Conferences. These conferences may be conducted by a District Judge, magistrate judge or designee of the Court.

f. Local Rule 16.3. Alternative Dispute Resolution

The court may, in the judge's discretion, refer any civil case for a settlement conference or any other method of alternative dispute resolution deemed appropriate to the needs of the case.

g. Local Rule 56.1. Summary Judgment Practice.

(a) Opening Briefs. The opening brief filed in support of a motion for summary judgment shall contain a separate section consisting of a concise, numbered listing of: (i) the material facts as to which the moving party contends there is no genuine issue to be tried with appropriate references to specific portions of the record, if necessary, or (ii) a statement why, even if all facts alleged in the opposing party's pleading are taken as true, the granting of summary judgment is warranted.

(b) Answering Briefs. The answering brief filed in response to a motion for summary judgment shall include a separate section with a concise, numbered statement of (i) the material facts as to which it is contended that there exists a genuine issue of material fact to be tried with appropriate references to specific portions of the record regarding evidence to support this fact or these facts, or (ii) the reason why, even if all allegations of the moving party are taken as true, summary judgment in the moving party's favor is unwarranted.

(c) This rule shall not in any way relieve the moving party of its initial burden of making a showing that there are no genuine issues of material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

(d) This Rule shall not relieve the respondent of any duty the respondent may have to properly support the response to the motion for summary judgment with evidentiary materials or specific references to evidence in the record demonstrating that there are genuine issues of material fact in order to defeat the motion for summary judgment as required by Rule 56(e), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

(e) Failure to comply with this rule may result in denial of the motion or entry of judgment.

h. Local Rule 68.3. Judicially-Hosted Settlement Conferences

With the consent of the parties, a judge of this Court may refer any civil case for a judicial settlement conference. A judicially hosted settlement conference is an informal, flexible, non-coercive and voluntary conference designed to aid in

settlement of a case.

(a) Attendance. The settlement judge may require the attendance of the parties and their representatives at the settlement conference. In the case of parties who are not individuals, any questions concerning the adequacy of the party's representation should be taken up with the settlement judge before the settlement conference is convened.

(b) Each party may forward, at least four days, or earlier if the settlement judge directs, prior to the scheduled conference, an ex parte, confidential memorandum to the designated settlement judge. The parties are encouraged to include in that memorandum the following:

1. The party's basic contentions.
2. The nature and extent of any past settlement negotiations in this case.
3. Expected monetary value of the case if liability is found.
4. Probability of success of each party (expressed as a percentage).
5. The strengths and weaknesses both factually and legally of each party's position.
6. Suitable range for settlement.
7. Any other matters deemed important (e.g., controlling case law, statutes).

(c) If a party chooses not to forward an ex parte confidential, memorandum to the settlement judge, then that party shall forward to the settlement judge at least four days before the settlement conference as much of the information specified in (b), just above, as possible with or without sending a copy to adversary counsel or at such time as the settlement judge may direct.

(d) The judicial officer conducting the settlement conference shall not discuss with the trial judge assigned in the case, or with anyone else other than settlement conference participants, anything regarding the settlement conference or the facts and arguments disclosed by the parties, except that the trial judge assigned to the case will be informed of any progress made toward settlement.

(e) The parties shall be prepared and shall participate in good faith (F.R.Civ.P. 16(f)).

(f) The judicial officer participating in the settlement conference shall be a neutral mediator and facilitator and shall play absolutely no role in the adjudication of the case once he is designated as settlement judge. Where requested by any party, all communications between that party and counsel, and the settlement judge will be kept strictly confidential.

(g) Counsel for each party shall prepare a brief oral summary (in the nature of what might be that party's final argument) to be given at the settlement conference in the presence of all participants.

(h) The settlement judge shall retain complete discretion regarding the format and the manner of carrying on the settlement conference. Participation by

any party shall, at all times, remain voluntary.

(i) Settlement discussions are confidential as provided by Rule 408, Fed. R.Evid. This applies to written submissions requested by the settlement judge as well as statements made in connection with the settlement conference.

i. Local Rule 72.3. Magistrate Judges - Civil Proceedings

(a) Notice of Opportunity to Consent to Proceed Before a Magistrate Judge. At the time a civil complaint is filed, plaintiff's counsel shall be given copies of Form 34 in the Appendix of Forms to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate, Election of Appeal to District Judge, and Order of Reference"). Plaintiff's counsel shall serve one copy of this form upon each defendant and shall confer with defense counsel to determine whether the parties consent to have a magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings in the case, including trial. Within 20 days after the appearance of the defendant, plaintiff's counsel shall file with the Clerk either:

(a) a statement certifying that he or she has conferred with defense counsel but the parties do not consent to the exercise of jurisdiction by a magistrate judge; or

(b) the signed "Consent to Proceed Before a United States Magistrate, Election of Appeal to District Judge, and Order of Reference."

(b) Appeals. If parties consenting to proceed before a magistrate judge elect to take any appeal in the case to the district judge, that election must be affirmatively indicated on the consent form by counsel for all parties. In the absence of such an election, appeal will be to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

(c) Notice of opportunity to Consent if Trial Date is Reset. In the event that a district judge cannot hold a civil trial on the date previously set for trial, the judge shall inform counsel of that fact as soon as possible. At the time counsel are informed that the district judge cannot hear the case on the date previously set, counsel also shall be informed as to their right to consent to trial before a magistrate judge and instructed to contact the office of the magistrate judge assigned to the case to ascertain possible dates on which the magistrate judge can hold the trial.

C. Cost and Delay Primarily Related to the Ways in which Litigants and their Attorneys Approach and Conduct Litigation. Section II(C)(3) of the Advisory Group's report identifies three principal causes of cost and delay that stem from ways in which litigants and their attorneys approach and conduct litigation: (a) discovery abuse, (b) problems of lawyer competence and failure to cooperate, and (c) lawyer and litigant choice for delay. The following local rules are promulgated and the following operating procedures are adopted to address these causes of cost and delay.

1. New Local Rules. Simultaneously with the adoption of this plan, the Court has issued notice of its intention to adopt the following local rules pursuant to Rule 83 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. These rules shall be effective on March 1, 1994.

a. Local Rule 26.4. Disclosure and Depositions of Expert Witnesses[2]

(a) Disclosure of Expert Witnesses. Each party shall disclose to every other party the name of every expert witness whom the party expects to call at trial pursuant to Rule 702 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. In addition to identifying each expert, the party who may offer that expert shall provide every other party with a curriculum vita containing the expert's qualifications.

(b) Timing of Disclosure. Unless the court designates a different time, experts shall be identified pursuant to subsection (a) at least 90 days before the date the case has been directed to be ready for trial, or, if the expert is intended solely to contradict or rebut an expert identified by another party under subsection (a) of this rule, within 30 days after the identification made by such other party.

(c) Expert Depositions. A party may depose any person identified pursuant to subsection (a) of this rule whose opinions may be presented at trial. Rule 26(b)(4)(C) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall apply to the fees and expenses incurred in connection with any deposition taken under this rule.

---

[2]Proposed Local Rules 26.4, 30.1, and 33.1 may have to be modified based on Congressional action with respect to changes in FRCP 26, 30, 31.

b. Local Rule 30.1. Deposition Limitations No party shall be entitled to take more than ten depositions without prior leave of court or to take any single deposition of more than eight hours without prior leave of court or agreement of the parties. In the event a party requests leave to take more than ten depositions, the request shall be accompanied by a motion for a discovery conference. This motion shall contain (1) a statement of the issues as they then appear; (2) a proposed discovery plan and discovery schedule; and (3) a statement showing that the attorney making the motion has made a reasonable effort to reach agreement with opposing counsel on the matters set forth in the motion.

c. Local Rule 33.1. Interrogatories No party shall be entitled to more than thirty interrogatories without prior leave of court. Any interrogatory that contains subparts shall be counted as one interrogatory as long as each subpart is closely related to the original question. Should it appear to the court, whether by motion or otherwise, that a party has used subparts as a means to circumvent the limitation on number, the party, along with the filing attorney, may be subjected to sanctions. Answers to interrogatories must be supplemented as may be required by the facts and circumstances of the case and by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

2. Court Operating Policies and Procedures. In order to address the causes of cost and delay stemming from the ways in which litigants and their attorneys approach and conduct litigation, the Court adopts the following operating policies and procedures.

a. The Court recommends the amendment of Federal Rule of Evidence 702 that would change Rule 702 to require that, in order to qualify as an expert witness, an individual must be able to substantially assist the trier of fact.

b. By June 1, 1994, the Clerk's Office will prepare a brochure describing the Court's Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan and existing policies and operating procedures of the Court. The brochure also will provide biographical information concerning the Court's district and magistrate judges and address areas of practice about which attorneys frequently have questions, as well as lawyer cooperation, lawyer professionalism, the manner in which actions by counsel may increase litigation cost and delay, and the attitude of the judges toward such actions.

c. The Court recommends that the Tennessee Bar Association, the Tennessee Trial Lawyers Association, the Tennessee Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, and local bar associations within the state increase their focus on federal practice, procedure, and the federal courts by sponsoring continuing legal education programs and devoting articles in their publications to federal practice. The Court encourages attorneys in the district to join or consider forming bar associations with a focus on federal practice.

II. COMPLIANCE WITH THE CIVIL JUSTICE REFORM ACT

In formulating the provisions of its Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan, the Court considered the six "principles and guidelines of litigation management and cost and delay reduction" set forth in 28 USC § 473(a) and the five "litigation management and cost and delay

reduction techniques" contained in 28 USC § 473(b). Discussion of these principles and techniques as well as Advisory Group recommendations considered by the court can be found in Appendix I attached to this plan.

III. CONCLUSION

This Plan shall be sent by the Clerk of Court, along with the brochure described in Section I(C)(2)(b) of the Plan, to all attorneys admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee. The Clerk also shall provide the plan to all attorneys admitted to practice before the Court after the Plan's initial distribution.

Within one year after the date of the adoption of this Plan, the Court will, after consultation with the Advisory Group on Litigation Cost and Delay, review the operation of the Plan and the condition of the Court's civil and criminal dockets, as required by 28 USC § 475.

APPENDIX I

In formulating the provisions of its Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan, the Court considered the six Principles and Guidelines of Litigation Management and Cost and Delay Reduction set forth in 28 USC § 473(a) and the five Litigation Management and Cost and Delay Reduction Techniques contained in 28 USC § 473(b).

Principles and Guidelines of Litigation Management and Cost and Delay Reduction

A. Systematic, differential treatment of civil cases.

The Advisory Group proposed no single recommendation concerning differential case management. Recognizing that under existing procedures of the court, there are separate case tracks for bankruptcy, prisoner, and social security cases, and that the Advisory Group did not recommend the adoption of a specific differential case management system, differentiated case management is not included in this plan.

Advisory Group recommendation B(3) concerning early judicial involvement was accepted by the Court in spirit as seen most particularly in Local Rule 16.1 Pretrial Orders and Conferences in Civil Actions (p. 6), and Local Rule 16.3 providing for judicially tailored alternative dispute resolution where appropriate.

B. Early and ongoing control of the pretrial process through involvement of a judicial officer. This principle was considered

and included, though not explicitly, in Local Rules 7.1 Motion Practice, 7.3 Duty to Meet and Confer Concerning Motions, 7.5 Resolution of Dispositive Motions By Magistrate Judge, 12.1 Extensions of time to Respond or Plead, 16.1 Pretrial Orders and Conferences in Civil Actions, 68.3 Judicially-Hosted Settlement Conferences, all these Rules contemplate early involvement in and control of a case by a judicial officer.

C. Monitoring of Complex and Other Appropriate Cases Through Discovery -- Case Management Conferences.

Discovery/Case Management Conferences are currently held by a judicial officer in appropriate cases. These practices are codified in the District's plan in Local Rule 7.1 Motion Practice, Local Rule 16.1 Pretrial Orders and Conferences in Civil Actions, Local Rule 16.3 Alternative Dispute Resolution, Local Rule 68.3 Judicially Hosted Settlement Conferences, and Local Rule 72.3 concerning opportunity to consent to proceed before a United States Magistrate Judge.

D. Encouragement of Cost-Effective Discovery.

The Court considers this principle an important part of its plan for Civil Justice Cost and Delay Reduction. As evidenced in the management techniques included in the Local Rules mentioned in A, B, and C above, cost-effective discovery is encouraged, even required by the provisions of this plan. Advisory Group recommendation C(2) included voluntary pretrial disclosure of expert witnesses and would permit witness depositions without a court order. The court considered this recommendation and the

current proposed amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence 26, 30, and 31 in drafting the provisions of this plan.

Local Rule 26.4 Disclosure and Depositions of Expert Witnesses requires disclosure of the names and other information of expert witnesses "at least 90 days before the date the case has been directed to be ready for trial...," places a 10 deposition limit without leave of court and otherwise regulates the taking of depositions. Local Rule 33.1 places a limit of thirty interrogatories without leave of court.

The court considered discovery misuse and redundancy to be a major factor in the rising costs of litigation in the district. These local rules are adopted in an effort to regulate federal practice in the Eastern District of Tennessee so as to eliminate these excess costs.

E. Attorney Certification of Non-Judicial Attempts To Resolve Discovery Disputes.

Advisory Group recommendation B(9) suggested broadening then Local Rule 37.1 (Meet and Confer Rule) to include all non-dispositive motions. The court considered and explicitly incorporated this recommendation in Local Rule 7.3 - Duty to Meet and Confer Concerning Motions.

F. Authorization for the Referral of Appropriate Cases to Alternative Dispute Resolution.

Advisory Group recommendation B(2) proposed a local rule giving the court the express authority to refer cases to ADR. The court expressly accepts recommendation B(2) in Local Rule 16.3

Alternative Dispute Resolution, which authorizes, in the court's discretion, referral of any civil case for a settlement conference or any type ADR deemed appropriate to the case. The court fully expects to make use of ADR and this authorization with increasing frequency as the Court, the bar, and litigants experiment with and become more comfortable with the various forms of ADR.

LITIGATION MANAGEMENT AND COST AND DELAY REDUCTION TECHNIQUES

A. Requirement of Discovery/Case Management Plans.

The Advisory Group did not recommend joint discovery case management plans to be compiled by counsel in all civil cases. However, provision is made in Local Rule 16.1 Pretrial Orders and Conferences in Civil Actions for a F.R.Civ.P. 16(b) scheduling conference and scheduling order in all civil cases. The court considered case management conferences as part of a system of differentiated case management and rejected this idea primarily because it was viewed as an extra step required of attorneys and litigants and would actually raise costs instead of reduce them. The Court notes that in complex and other appropriate cases, the court already provides for a scheduling conference and discovery management plan.

B. Requirement of Attorney Authority at Pretrial Conferences.

Advisory Group recommendation B(3) was accepted and is included in Local Rule 16.1(b) which requires that at all pretrial conferences, each party "who is not proceeding pro se shall be

represented by an attorney who has the authority to bind that party regarding all matters identified by the court for discussion at the conference and all reasonably related matters." The attendance of parties or their representatives also may be required where settlement will be discussed at the pretrial conference.

C. Requirement that Extension Requests be Signed by Counsel and Client.

The court considered both the Advisory Group recommendation that such a provision not be adopted and the perception that fewer delays would be requested where the client was informed as to the ramifications of the request for delay. The court has retained the authority, in Local Rule 12.1(b), to require written, signed certification where appropriate. Certification is not mandatory but may be required in the discretion of the court.

D. Establishment of a Neutral Evaluation Program.

Advisory Group recommendation B(2) encouraging experimentation with ADR forms and referral of appropriate cases to ADR includes the Early Neutral Evaluation currently practiced in the Court's Southern Division. Local Rule 16.3 explicitly authorizes the referral of any civil case to an appropriate method of ADR. The court considered carefully all types of ADR now being practiced in various districts across the country but rather than include specific details regarding ADR in the Eastern District of Tennessee, the court felt it was important to maintain flexibility as each specific case will require a judicially-tailored method of ADR.

E. Requirement of Client Participation in Settlement Conferences.

Advisory Group recommendation B(1) suggests that use of magistrate judge settlement conferences be expanded. Local Rule 68.3 (a) specifically provides that "the settlement judge may require the attendance of the parties and their representatives at the settlement conference." Similar judicial discretion is contemplated by Local Rule 16.1(b) allowing the requirement of client attendance at a pretrial conference where settlement is discussed.

The foregoing constitutes the Plan for Civil Litigation Cost and Delay Reduction as mandated by The Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

December 1, 1993.

E N T E R :

James H. Jarvis,
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Thomas G. Hull,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

R. Allan Edgar,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Leon Jordan,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE