

**VOTES FROM MAY 19-20, 2000**  
**SUPREME COURT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Discussion/Change/Addition	Vote	Page
Parental Notification re: <del>confidentiality provision</del>	22 in favor of accepting the subcommittee's recommendation; 5 against. Passes 22 to 5.	<del>1306</del> 1307
Parental Notification Rule 1.4(b) re: proposed language in Comment 3 to Rule 1 (located on page 5 of the rules)	No one opposed to adding that comment to the rules. Passes unanimously	1308- 1309
Parental Notification Rule 1.4(b)(2)(6) re: inserting language to Comment 3 (discussed above): "Whether the judge assigned to hear and decide the application, the judge to hear any disqualification, recusal or objection, a judge authorized to transfer," . . .	Insertion of language to Comment 3 passes unanimously.	1313
Parental Notification Rule 1.4(b)(1) re: whether the subcommittee should make an amendment to the rule in light of the Supreme Court's decision, and the subcommittee voted against making that change, instead relying on the case law to speak for itself.	No one opposed to the subcommittee's recommendation. Adopted by the full committee.	1316- 1317
Parental Notification Rule 3.3(b): Proposal to take out the sentence of 3.3(b) that reads: "If the court of appeals reverses the trial court order, it must also state in its judgment that the application is granted."	24 votes in favor of taking out the second sentence and 1 against. Passes with the recommendation that the sentence be stricken.	1341
Parental Notification: Question as to whether to change the form to remove the requirement that the minor show identification because they were trying to get their applications notarized. Parental Notification subcommittee did not see it as a problem so they decided to leave it alone.	No one opposed to following the subcommittee which is to do nothing with the issue.	1348

Discussion/Change/Addition	Vote	Page
Parental Notification: Re: <del>1) Amicus could submit briefs</del> on general principles of law without reference to any particular case and without including any identifying information and that it should be submitted to the Supreme Court; and 2) those involved in the proceeding could confidentially submit the amicus to the appropriate court when the case is appealed.	Passes – no one opposed to the subcommittees recommendations	1351
Parental Notification Rule 1.10(a): Strike the language on the 4 <sup>th</sup> line “such as a guardian ad litem or witness”.	Unanimous vote to strike the line.	1354
Parental Notification: Regarding changes the subcommittee recommended on Rules 1.9(b), (e), (f) and (g) dealing with confidentiality of documents and reimbursement and Form 2(d).	No one opposed to the subcommittee’s recommendations. Passes unanimously.	1361
Parental Notification: Subcommittee decided that Form 2(d) should not be amended to provide more room for findings and conclusions, but recommended that they change “comment” to “findings of fact and conclusions of law”.	No one opposed to the change. Passes and is adopted as the recommendation of this committee.	1362
Parental Notification: Re: Rule 2.2 subcommittee took the position that they didn’t need to change the language regarding which clerk is to perform the duties; subcommittee found on Rule 2.5(e) that there was no necessity for clarification where the trial court denies an application without prejudice because they can’t locate the minor; amend Comment 3 to clarify that appellate judges may also obtain the verification page in order to address the recusal or disqualification issues.	No one opposed to these suggestions on these technical issues so it is approved by the committee adopting the report of the subcommittee.	1364
Parental Notification re: Form 2(g)	Approved.	1383
Parental Notification Rule 1.6(a) re: disqualification and recusal rule provision; changing the language to read: “An objection to a judge or a motion to recuse or disqualify a judge must be filed or made on the record promptly after learning what judge will hear the case” and deleting the other “10:00 a.m.” language.	25 in favor, 2 against. Adopted.	1391

Discussion/Change/Addition	Vote	Page
Parental Notification 1.6(a): <del>vote on addition of language</del> : "An objection to an appellate judge or a motion to recuse or disqualify an appellate judge must be filed before 10:00 a.m. of the first business day after the notice of appeal is filed" and the 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence would change to say: "A judge who chooses to recuse voluntarily must do so instanter."	No one opposed; passes unanimously.	1404
Recusal: Vote on who wants some rule dealing with judges recusing when they're represented or something along those lines (Option 11, 11a, etc.).	31 voted for a rule; 5 voted that they do not want such a rule.	1455
Recusal: Vote on whether or not to incorporate into the recusal motion adversity, i.e., when a lawyer who is representing the adverse party—the second part of 11a.	24 in favor of expanding Option 11 to include that concept; 5 against including the adverse lawyer into Option 11.	1465
Recusal: Vote on Option 11.	26 in favor; 2 opposed. Option 11 passes.	1496
Recusal: Vote on Options 9 and 9a re: campaign contributions.	9 received 21 votes; 9a received 8 votes. Option 9 carries.	1557
Recusal: Vote on whether or not to have a return feature.	16 in favor of a return feature; 13 for no return feature.	1576-1577
Recusal: Vote to accept Option 9 as written, but end it with a comma "unless the excessive contribution is returned in accordance with Section 253.155 of the Election Code."	19 votes in favor; 5 against.	1593
Recusal: Opinion regarding a time limit on Option 10 such as on Option 9.	No disagreement.	1612
Recusal: Vote on Option 10 with the language added about limiting it to time.	22 in favor of Option 10 with the language; nobody against. Passes 22-0.	1621
Recusal/disqualification: Vote on changes to subsection (c), waiver.	No opposition.	1633
Recusal/disqualification: Discussion on the waiver to strike "or cured".	No opposition.	1647
Agreement to put a paragraph at the end of the recusal provisions saying that they don't apply to Justices of the Peace.	No opposition.	1652