HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION	bill analysis	5/4/1999	HB 1461 Dunnam (CSHB 1461 by Thompson)	
SUBJECT:	Revising judicial rulemaking authority			
COMMITTEE:	Judicial Affairs — committee substitute recommended			
VOTE:	8 ayes — Thompso Uresti	on, Hartnett, Capelo, Desh	notel, Garcia, Hinojosa, Jim Solis,	
	1 nay — Shields			
WITNESSES:	For —Walt Borges, Texas Watch			
	Against — Alex Albright; Gilbert J. Low; Richard R. Orsinger; Judge Mike Wood			
	On —Richard C. Hile, Texas Trial Lawyers Association; Denise Davis			
BACKGROUND:	Under current law, the Texas Supreme Court and the Court of Criminal Appeals have full authority to promulgate suitable rules, forms, and regulations for court administration and necessary rules of procedure and evidence.			
DIGEST:	Court and the Court reported to the Leg meetings of any gro- subject to open me	t of Criminal Appeals by sislature, that they be acco oup named by the courts t	rocedures for the Texas Supreme requiring that rule changes be ompanied by a fiscal note, that to consider changes in rules be tion laws, and that input on rule	
	of a proposed rule opening of a legisla days after the legis courts to adopt inte for the proper admi courts could not co The courts would b amendment to an e	or amendment to an existi- ative session. The rule cou- lative session ended. CSH erim rules when the Legisl- inistration of justice, as loo omply with CSHB 1461 w be required to prepare a fis- xisting rule outlining pote	submit to the Legislature a copy ing rule within 30 days of the ald not take effect earlier than 90 IB 1461 would authorize the lature is not in session if needed ong as specific reasons why the could be published in an opinion. scal note for a proposed rule or ential costs and containing a ponomic impact on persons who	

## HB 1461 House Research Organization page 2

	use the civil and criminal justice system. The comptroller would be authorized to assist in the preparation of this note on request.		
	The Office of Court Administration would prepare an opinion poll on the rule to be sent to appeals court judges, district judges, county judges, statutory county court judges, and statutory probate court judges within 15 days after the proposed rule was sent to the Legislature. Results would be reported within 75 days after the legislative session began.		
	CSHB 1461 would take effect September 1, 1999.		
SUPPORTERS SAY:	CSHB 1461 would improve cooperation between the judiciary and the Legislature in drafting procedural rules. In the last two years, the Texas Supreme Court has adopted several rules that should have been considered in cooperation with the Legislature. This bill would ensure that Legislature is notified of potential rule changes in a timely way.		
	The courts would not be inconvenienced by legislative reporting requirements, since most rules drafted by the courts are the product of years of deliberation. For the few rules that are prompted by circumstances requiring faster action, the bill would provide interim rulemaking powers to both courts.		
	The bill would not make substantive change to the current system. The courts still would retain the authority to draft rules of procedure and evidence, subject only to legislative notification. The procedures outlined in CSHB 1461merely would codify the importance of keeping the Legislature in the loop.		
	Many feel that the courts have overstepped their rulemaking authority in several areas. For example, the Texas Supreme Court has promulgated rules on campaign finance reform for judicial elections that clearly are outside the generally accepted parameters for court-established rules of procedure and evidence. Such issues involving the election system are best left to the Legislature. The Supreme Court waited to announce its campaign finance rules until after the deadline for bills to be filed, which suggests that the court may not be fully cooperating with the legislative branch or following the		

Texas Constitution's separation of powers.

## HB 1461 House Research Organization page 3

The court's own adoption of certain tort reform rules in 1997, when it became apparent that the legislation implementing these tort reform rules would be indefinitely stalled, underscores the need for clearer guidelines like those proposed in CSHB 1461. **OPPONENTS** The Texas Supreme Court and the Court of Criminal Appeals currently SAY: operate under a rulemaking system that considers proposals from an advisory committee composed of a diverse membership of judges, attorneys, and academia. The members represent all areas of practice from different parts of the state. The courts also seek input from the State Bar associations and sections. This system has worked well and does not need to be changed. Most, if not all, attorneys who serve on these committees volunteer their services. Some of the best known and most capable lawyers in the state of Texas volunteered their time in drafting the new discovery rules. The state benefits but does not pay for the high level of legal expertise it receives under the current system. If the system is changed, proposed rules would be reviewed every two years by the Legislature. No lawyer is going to volunteer to draft rules that would need to be reviewed by the Legislature in two years time. All states give the courts the power to write their own rules on procedure and evidence. This bill would undercut the court's current authority. As part of this authority, the Supreme Court should be allowed to write ethics rules for judges that touch upon campaign finance. The court is well within its power to prescribe campaign rules for judges and electoral contests. NOTES: The committee substitute changed the original bill by deleting a Sunset provision, changing "emergency rulemaking power" to "interim rulemaking power," and deleting a provision that would have required the Office of Court Administration to employ a public access liaison to oversee and administer open records requests. HJR 54 by Dunnam, which proposes a constitutional amendment relating to

HJR 54 by Dunnam, which proposes a constitutional amendment relating to the rulemaking power of the Supreme Court, was reported favorably by the Judicial Affairs Committee on April 15.