



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688  
www.courts.ca.gov

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: September 21, 2018

---

Title	Agenda Item Type
Protective Orders: Entry of Interstate and Tribal Protective Orders, Canadian Protective Orders, and Gun Violence Restraining Orders into CLETS	Action Required
Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected	Effective Date
Amend rules 1.51 and 2.503; adopt form DV-630	September 21, 2018
Recommended by	Date of Report
Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee	July 31, 2018
Hon. Jerilyn Borack, Cochair	Contact
Hon. Mark Juhas, Cochair	Gregory Tanaka, 415-865-7671 gregory.tanaka@jud.ca.gov
Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee	Frances Ho, 415-865-7662, frances.ho@jud.ca.gov
Hon. Ann I. Jones, Chair	Patrick O'Donnell, 415-865-7665, patrick.o'donnell@jud.ca.gov

---

### Executive Summary

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommend amending two rules of the California Rules of Court relating to protective orders to (1) include the registration of interstate and tribal court protective orders, Canadian protective orders, and gun violence restraining orders as protective orders that must be submitted to the court with a completed California Law Enforcement and Telecommunications System (CLETS) confidential information form; and (2) add records in gun violence prevention proceedings to the list of electronic court records that are accessible only at the courthouse and not remotely. These changes implement new statutory requirements. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory committee also recommends the adoption of a new mandatory form to implement

the requirements of Senate Bill 204 (Stats. 2017, ch. 98), which allows domestic violence protection orders issued in a Canadian civil court to be registered and enforced in California.

## **Recommendation**

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective January 1, 2019:

1. Amend rule 1.51 to include interstate and tribal court protective orders, Canadian protective orders, and gun violence restraining orders as requiring submission to the court of a completed *Confidential CLETS Information* form;
2. Amend rule 2.503 to include gun violence prevention proceedings to the list of records that may not be accessed remotely; and
3. Adopt a new mandatory form, *Order to Register Canadian Domestic Violence Protective/Restraining Order* (form DV-630), to implement the requirements of Senate Bill 204.

The text of the amended rules is attached at pages 7–10; the new form is attached at pages 11–12.

## **Relevant Previous Council Action**

Rule 1.51 was adopted effective January 1, 2011, to provide direction to the public and the courts on how the *Confidential CLETS Information* form was to be used, who had access to the information on it, and how long courts had to retain the form. An earlier version of rule 2.503 was first adopted in 2002 as rule 2073 to establish statewide policies on public access to trial courts' electronic records while balancing privacy protections and other legitimate interests. Rule 2073 was amended in 2004 and 2005, then renumbered as rule 2.503 and amended in 2007. The rule was subsequently amended three more times to account for the inclusion of additional case types. No previous council action has been taken on Canadian protective orders as Senate Bill 204 enacted new law effective January 1, 2018.

## **Analysis/Rationale**

### **Amendments to rule 1.51**

Rule 1.51(a) lists the protective orders that must be submitted to the court with a completed *Confidential CLETS Information* form. Under the existing rule, the list includes all the protective orders issued under Code of Civil Procedure sections 527.6, 527.8, and 527.85; Family Code section 6320; and Welfare and Institutions Code sections 213.5 and 15657.03.

The list should be updated to reflect additional statutes that provide that other types of protective orders must be entered. The law requires interstate and tribal court protective orders to be entered into CLETS under Family Code section 6404, Canadian protective orders under Family Code

section 6454, and gun violence restraining orders under Penal Code sections 18100–18205.<sup>1</sup> To ensure that all required information from protective orders is properly entered into CLETS, using the *Confidential CLETS Information* form, the statutory sections prescribing the entry of out-of-state, tribal court, Canadian, and gun violence protective orders need to be added to rule 1.51(a).

### **New form DV-630**

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council adopt a mandatory form, *Order to Register Canadian Domestic Violence Protective/Restraining Order* (form DV-630), to implement the requirements of Senate Bill 204 (Fam. Code, § 6400 et seq.).

Family Code section 6450 et seq. sets forth the following requirements for registration and enforcement of Canadian domestic violence protection orders in California:

- 1. *The order must be issued in a civil proceeding in English (Fam. Code, § 6451(a)).*** Family Code section 6451(a) states that for purposes of the act, “ ‘Canadian domestic violence protection order’ means a judgment or part of a judgment or order issued in English in a civil proceeding by a court of Canada under law of the issuing jurisdiction that relates to domestic violence ... .”

The legislative history of SB 204 states that the law only includes orders issued by civil courts because of the due process concerns raised by enforcing protection orders issued by a foreign country’s criminal court system.<sup>2</sup>

- 2. *A certified copy of the Canadian protective/restraining order is required (Fam. Code, § 6454(a)).*** A certified copy of a Canadian protective order must be presented to the court for registration. This is different from the statutory procedure under Family Code section 6404 for registration of interstate and tribal court protective orders, which does not require a certified copy.
- 3. *The order must be sealed and entered into CLETS (Fam. Code, § 6454(a)).*** Once registered, consistent with the procedures for other foreign domestic violence restraining orders under Family Code sections 6380 and 6404, Canadian protective orders are also required to be:
  - a. Entered into CLETS;
  - b. Sealed; and

---

<sup>1</sup> More specifically, Penal Code section 18115(a) prescribes that the court shall notify the Department of Justice when a gun violence restraining order is issued or renewed; section 18115(c) states that the notices shall be submitted electronically in a manner prescribed by the department. The department has directed that CLETS be the procedure for submitting gun violence restraining order information into the California Restraining and Protective Order System (CARPOS). (See CARPOS Manual § 6.4.1.)

<sup>2</sup> Sen. Rules Com., Off. of Sen. Floor Analyses, Rep. on Sen. Bill No. 204 (2017–2018 Reg. Sess.) July 7, 2017, p. 7.

- c. Accessed only by law enforcement, the person who registered the order upon written request with proof of identification, the defense after arraignment on criminal charges involving an alleged violation of the order, or upon further order of the court.

The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee considered revising an existing form, *Order to Register Out-of-State or Tribal Court Protective/Restraining Order (form DV-600)*, to include Canadian protective orders. However, unlike the statutory procedures for registration of interstate and tribal court protective orders, the registration of Canadian protective orders—as described above—requires the submission of a certified copy of the order and is limited to orders issued in civil proceedings. Hence, the committee is recommending that the council adopt a specific new order that expressly satisfies the statutory requirements for the registry of Canadian protective orders.

### **Amendments to rule 2.503**

The Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee recommends that rule 2.503(c) be amended to add records in gun violence prevention proceedings to the list of electronic records that are not accessible remotely and are available only at the courthouse. This proposal is consistent with the history and purpose of that subdivision.

Rule 2.503 (formerly rule 2074) was adopted in recognition that certain types of cases contain sensitive private information. Although these cases are public records, “unrestricted Internet access to case files would compromise privacy and, in some cases, could increase the risk of personal harm to litigants and others whose private information appears in case files.”<sup>3</sup> Hence, to balance the right of public access to trial records against the right of privacy, a rule was adopted that provides that access to certain sensitive types of case records will be provided only at the courthouse.

The original list of case records available only at the courthouse included records in family and juvenile proceedings, guardianship and conservatorship proceedings, mental health proceedings, criminal proceedings, and civil harassment proceedings. Subsequently, rule 2.503(c) has been amended several times. Additional types of records that are presently available only at the courthouse are records in elder and dependent adult abuse prevention proceedings, workplace violence prevention proceedings, private postsecondary school violence prevention proceedings, and proceedings to compromise the claims of a minor. Because gun violence prevention proceedings share many of the same characteristics as the proceedings described above and raise similar privacy and safety concerns, it is appropriate to provide the same type of limited, courthouse-only access for records in these proceedings as for those already included under rule 2.503(c).

The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) is concurrently recommending amendments to rule 2.503 in its council report entitled “Rules and Forms: Remote Access to

---

<sup>3</sup> Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Committee rep., *Public Access to Electronic Trial Court Records* (Oct. 5, 2001), p. 7. The report explains the legal and policy reasons for providing courthouse-only access in certain case types.

Electronic Records.” ITAC’s amendments make a technical change to the list of electronic records indicated in rule 2.503(b) by changing the number of case types referenced from 9 to 10. This change would correct the inconsistency between subdivision (b) and (c) of rule 2.503, arising from an amendment adding a 10th case type, effective January 1, 2012, without a corresponding amendment cross-referencing the list in rule 2.503(b). The Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee’s current recommended changes to rule 2.503 adds an 11th case type for gun violence prevention proceedings. To reflect this addition, yet another change is required to both the above-mentioned cross-reference in rule 2.503(b) and the list of case types under 2.503(c). To reconcile all of the amendments to rule 2.503 recommended by both the Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee and the Information Technology Advisory Committee, the committees are jointly proposing one consolidated, amended rule 2.503 for the council’s consideration. (See the text of the amended rule at pages 7–10.)

### **Policy implications**

The recommended amendments to rule 1.51 and 2.503 will result in uniform procedures and policy statewide for consistent entry of protective orders into CLETS—submitted with the *Confidential CLETS Information* form—and ensure that the list of case records containing sensitive information that are not remotely accessible to the public is updated and current. The adoption of new mandatory form DV-630 will effectively implement the requirements of Senate Bill 204.

### **Comments**

The proposal circulated for public comment as part of the spring 2018 invitation-to-comment cycle from April 27 through June 8, 2018. During the comment period, the proposal received six comments. All the commenters were in agreement with the proposal with no suggested changes or modifications. The committees recommend that the council approve the amendments to rules 1.51 and 2.503 and the adoption of new mandatory form DV-600. A chart with the full text of the comments received and the committees’ responses is attached at pages 13–15.

### **Alternatives considered**

The rule recommendations principally update rules 1.51 and 2.503 to reflect recent developments in the statutes relating to protective orders. While the rules could have been left unchanged, this would create a risk that important information about certain protective orders might not be properly entered into CLETS and that gun violence restraining orders might be made remotely accessible, unlike any other type of protective order. Furthermore, as mentioned above, regarding the development of the form order for registering Canadian protective orders, the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee considered revising the order for registering out-of-state and tribal protective orders to cover this additional type of order but concluded that, based on the unique requirements for registering a Canadian protective order, it would be better to have a separate order for this purpose.

## **Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

The recommended amendments to rule 1.51 relating to entry of orders into CLETS will largely reflect and clarify current practices; hence, they should not require any significant implementation requirements, result in costs for the courts, or have operational impacts. To the extent that any courts currently make gun violence retraining orders available remotely, amending rule 2.503(c) to add such orders to the list of records not available remotely may require some programming; however, the number of such orders available remotely is likely very small. Finally, the adoption of the new *Order to Register Canadian Domestic Violence Protective/Restraining Order* (form DV-630) should make it easier for parties to register Canadian protective orders, and for courts to process these orders.

## **Attachments and Links**

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rules 1.51 and 2.503, at pages 7–10
2. Form DV-630, at pages 11–12
3. Attachment A: Chart of comments, at pages 13–15
4. Link A: Senate Bill 204 (Stats. 2017, ch. 98),  
[https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201720180SB204](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB204)

Rules 1.51 and 2.503 of the California Rules of Court are amended, effective January 1, 2019, to read:

1 **Rule 1.51. California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)**  
2 **information form**

3  
4 **(a) Confidential CLETS Information form to be submitted to the court**

5  
6 A person requesting protective orders under Code of Civil Procedure section 527.6,  
7 527.8, or 527.85; Family Code section 6320, 6404, or 6454; Penal Code sections  
8 18100–18205; or Welfare and Institutions Code section 213.5 or 15657.03 must  
9 submit to the court with the request a completed *Confidential CLETS Information*  
10 form.

11  
12 **(b)–(e) \* \* \***

13  
14  
15 **Rule 2.503. ~~Public access~~ Application and scope**

16  
17 **(a) General right of access by the public**

18  
19 (1) All electronic records must be made reasonably available to the public in  
20 some form, whether in electronic or in paper form, except those that are  
21 sealed by court order or made confidential by law.

22  
23 (2) The rules in this article apply only to access to electronic records by the  
24 public.

25  
26 **(b) Electronic access required to extent feasible**

27  
28 A court that maintains the following records in electronic form must provide  
29 electronic access to them, both remotely and at the courthouse, to the extent it is  
30 feasible to do so:

31  
32 (1) Registers of actions (as defined in Gov. Code, § 69845), calendars, and  
33 indexes in all cases; and

34  
35 (2) All court records in civil cases, except those listed in (c)(1)–~~(9)~~(11).

36  
37 **(c) Courthouse electronic access only**

38  
39 A court that maintains the following records in electronic form must provide  
40 electronic access to them at the courthouse, to the extent it is feasible to do so, but  
41 may not provide public remote electronic access to these records ~~only to the records~~  
42 ~~governed by (b)~~:  
43

- 1 (1) Records in a proceeding under the Family Code, including proceedings for
- 2 dissolution, legal separation, and nullity of marriage; child and spousal
- 3 support proceedings; child custody proceedings; and domestic violence
- 4 prevention proceedings;
- 5
- 6 (2) Records in a juvenile court proceeding;
- 7
- 8 (3) Records in a guardianship or conservatorship proceeding;
- 9
- 10 (4) Records in a mental health proceeding;
- 11
- 12 (5) Records in a criminal proceeding;
- 13
- 14 (6) Records in proceedings to compromise the claims of a minor or a person with
- 15 a disability;
- 16
- 17 ~~(7)(6)~~Records in a civil harassment proceeding under Code of Civil Procedure
- 18 section 527.6;
- 19
- 20 ~~(8)(7)~~Records in a workplace violence prevention proceeding under Code of Civil
- 21 Procedure section 527.8;
- 22
- 23 ~~(9)(8)~~Records in a private postsecondary school violence prevention proceeding
- 24 under Code of Civil Procedure section 527.85;
- 25
- 26 ~~(10)(9)~~Records in an elder or dependent adult abuse prevention proceeding under
- 27 Welfare and Institutions Code section 15657.03; and
- 28
- 29 ~~(10) Records in proceedings to compromise the claims of a minor or a person with~~
- 30 ~~a disability.~~
- 31
- 32 (11) Records in a gun violence prevention proceeding under Penal Code sections
- 33 18100–18205.

34

35 (d) \* \* \*

36

37 (e) **Remote electronic access allowed in extraordinary criminal cases**

38

39 Notwithstanding (c)(5), the presiding judge of the court, or a judge assigned by the

40 presiding judge, may exercise discretion, subject to (e)(1), to permit remote

41 electronic access by the public to all or a portion of the public court records in an

42 individual criminal case if (1) the number of requests for access to documents in

43 the case is extraordinarily high and (2) responding to those requests would



Rules 1.51 and 2.503 of the California Rules of Court are amended, effective January 1, 2019, to read:

1 significantly burden the operations of the court. An individualized determination  
2 must be made in each case in which such remote ~~electronic~~ access is provided.

3  
4 (1) In exercising discretion under (e), the judge should consider the relevant  
5 factors, such as:

6  
7 (A) \* \* \*

8  
9 (B) The benefits to and burdens on the parties in allowing remote ~~electronic~~  
10 access, including possible impacts on jury selection; and

11  
12 (C) \* \* \*

13  
14 (2) The court should, to the extent feasible, redact the following information  
15 from records to which it allows remote access under (e): driver license  
16 numbers; dates of birth; social security numbers; Criminal Identification and  
17 Information numbers and National Crime Information Center numbers;  
18 addresses and phone numbers of parties, victims, witnesses, and court  
19 personnel; medical or psychiatric information; financial information; account  
20 numbers; and other personal identifying information. The court may order  
21 any party who files a document containing such information to provide the  
22 court with both an original unredacted version of the document for filing in  
23 the court file and a redacted version of the document for remote ~~electronic~~  
24 access. No juror names or other juror identifying information may be  
25 provided by remote ~~electronic~~ access. This subdivision does not apply to any  
26 document in the original court file; it applies only to documents that are  
27 available by remote ~~electronic~~ access.  
28

29 (3) Five days' notice must be provided to the parties and the public before the  
30 court makes a determination to provide remote ~~electronic~~ access under this  
31 rule. Notice to the public may be accomplished by posting notice on the  
32 court's ~~Web site~~ website. Any person may file comments with the court for  
33 consideration, but no hearing is required.  
34

35 (4) The court's order permitting remote ~~electronic~~ access must specify which  
36 court records will be available by remote ~~electronic~~ access and what  
37 categories of information are to be redacted. The court is not required to  
38 make findings of fact. The court's order must be posted on the court's ~~Web~~  
39 site website and a copy sent to the Judicial Council.  
40

41 (f)–(i) \* \* \*

1 **Advisory Committee Comment**

2  
3 The rule allows a level of access by the public to all electronic records that is at least equivalent  
4 to the access that is available for paper records and, for some types of records, is much greater. At  
5 the same time, it seeks to protect legitimate privacy concerns.  
6

7 **Subdivision (c).** This subdivision excludes certain records (those other than the register, calendar,  
8 and indexes) in specified types of cases (notably criminal, juvenile, and family court matters)  
9 from public remote ~~electronic~~ access. The committee recognized that while these case records are  
10 public records and should remain available at the courthouse, either in paper or electronic form,  
11 they often contain sensitive personal information. The court should not publish that information  
12 over the Internet. However, the committee also recognized that the use of the Internet may be  
13 appropriate in certain criminal cases of extraordinary public interest where information regarding  
14 a case will be widely disseminated through the media. In such cases, posting of selected  
15 nonconfidential court records, redacted where necessary to protect the privacy of the participants,  
16 may provide more timely and accurate information regarding the court proceedings, and may  
17 relieve substantial burdens on court staff in responding to individual requests for documents and  
18 information. Thus, under subdivision (e), if the presiding judge makes individualized  
19 determinations in a specific case, certain records in criminal cases may be made available over  
20 the Internet.  
21

22 **Subdivisions (f) and (g).** These subdivisions limit electronic access to records (other than the  
23 register, calendars, or indexes) to a case-by-case basis and prohibit bulk distribution of those  
24 records. These limitations are based on the qualitative difference between obtaining information  
25 from a specific case file and obtaining bulk information that may be manipulated to compile  
26 personal information culled from any document, paper, or exhibit filed in a lawsuit. This type of  
27 aggregate information may be exploited for commercial or other purposes unrelated to the  
28 operations of the courts, at the expense of privacy rights of individuals.  
29

30 Courts must send a copy of the order permitting remote ~~electronic~~ access in extraordinary  
31 criminal cases to: Criminal Justice Services, Judicial Council of California, 455 Golden Gate  
32 Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3688.

Clerk stamps date here when form is filed.

**DRAFT  
Not approved by  
the Judicial Council**

*Instructions: Use this form to register a civil Canadian domestic violence or family violence protective/restraining order in California. Registration means that the order will be entered into a database that all law enforcement in California can view. Although registration is not required for the order to be enforced, it is helpful to have the order in the database. There is no fee to file this form. A certified copy of the order must be submitted with this form. The order must have been issued in English.*

**1 Information About the Person Registering the Protective/Restraining Order:**

a. My Name: \_\_\_\_\_

- b.  I do not have a lawyer for this case (fill in items c–f below).  
 I have a lawyer for this case (fill in your lawyer’s information below and for items c–e):

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ State Bar No.: \_\_\_\_\_

Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

- c. Address (If you want to keep your home address private, give a different mailing address instead.):

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

d. Telephone (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

e. E-mail Address (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

f. I am (check one):

- protected by the attached order.  
 restrained by the attached order.  
 a legal guardian of a minor protected by the attached order.  
 other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Fill in court name and street address:

Superior Court of California, County of \_\_\_\_\_

Fills in case number:

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**2 Restrained Person**

**Full Name:** \_\_\_\_\_  
Sex:  M  F Height: \_\_\_\_\_ Weight: \_\_\_\_\_ Hair Color: \_\_\_\_\_ Eye Color: \_\_\_\_\_  
Race: \_\_\_\_\_ Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address (if known): \_\_\_\_\_  
City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
Relationship to protected person: \_\_\_\_\_

**3 To the best of my knowledge, the attached order:**

- Is a certified copy of a Canadian protective/restraining order.
- Was issued in English by a civil (noncriminal) court in Canada.
- Was made because of domestic violence or family violence.
- Is currently valid and in effect.
- Has not been changed, canceled, or replaced by another court order.
- Expires on (date): \_\_\_\_\_  
month/day/year

**This is a Court Order.**

4 I ask that the attached order be registered with this court for entry into the California Law Enforcement and Telecommunications System (CLETS). My request is voluntary. I understand that registration of the order is not necessary for enforcement.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above information is true and correct.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Type or print your name*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Sign your name*

*(To be completed by court)*

The attached Canadian Domestic Violence Protective/Restraining Order is registered and enforceable in California, and can be entered into CLETS, unless it ends or is changed by the court that made it.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Judge (or Judicial Officer)*

**Court Clerk Must Seal This Form and Attached Foreign Protection Order**

This form sets forth the procedure to register a foreign protection order under Family Code section 6404:

1. No fee may be charged for the registration of the foreign protection order.
2. No court hearing is required to register the foreign protection order.
3. The case file containing this form and the attached foreign protection order must be sealed under Family Code section 6404(a).
4. Access to the foreign protection order is allowed only to law enforcement, the person who registered the order upon written request with proof of identification, the defense after arraignment on criminal charges involving an alleged violation of the order, or on further order of the court.

*(Clerk will fill out this part.)*

**—Clerk’s Certificate—**

*Clerk’s Certificate*  
*[seal]*

I certify that this *Order to Register Canadian Domestic Violence Protective/Restraining Order* is a true and correct copy of the original on file in the court.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Clerk, by \_\_\_\_\_, Deputy

**This is a Court Order.**

**SP18-35**

**Protective Orders: Entry of Interstate and Tribal Protective Orders, Canadian Protective Orders, and Gun Violence Restraining Orders into CLETS; New Form for Registration of Canadian Domestic Violence Protective Orders; rule amendment to add Gun Violence Restraining Orders (Amend rules 1.51 and 2.503; adopt form DV-630)**

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (\*)

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Committee Response</b>
1.	California Lawyers Association, by the Executive Committee of the Family Law Section (FLEXCOM)	A	The Executive Committee of the Family Law Section of the California Lawyers Association agrees with the proposed changes, and believes the proposals appropriately address the stated purposes.	No response required.
2.	Office of the Attorney General California Department of Justice Bureau of Criminal Identification & Investigative Services Branch by Nicole Quinn, Manager	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the proposals appropriately address the stated purpose? Yes.</li> <li>Additional comments An additional order type will need to be created in CARPOS for Canadian Domestic Violence Restraining and Protective Orders.</li> </ul>	No response required.
3.	Superior Court of Los Angeles (no name provided)	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with proposed changes.</li> <li>Would three months from Judicial Council approval of these proposals until their effective date provide sufficient time for implementation? Staff training and coding can be accomplished in 3 months.</li> </ul>	No response required.
4.	Superior Court of Riverside County by Susan D. Ryan, Chief Deputy of Legal Services	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose? Yes</li> <li>Would the proposal provide cost savings? No.</li> <li>What would the implementation requirements be for courts? Train staff, revise procedures, create new codes for</li> </ul>	No response required.

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree.

**SP18-35**

**Protective Orders: Entry of Interstate and Tribal Protective Orders, Canadian Protective Orders, and Gun Violence Restraining Orders into CLETS; New Form for Registration of Canadian Domestic Violence Protective Orders; rule amendment to add Gun Violence Restraining Orders (Amend rules 1.51 and 2.503; adopt form DV-630)**

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (\*)

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>case management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would three months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation? Yes.</li> <li>• How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes? Equally well.</li> </ul>	
5.	Superior Court of San Diego County, by Mike Roddy, Executive Officer	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would the proposals provide cost savings? No.</li> <li>• What would the implementation requirements be for courts? For example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), changing docket codes in case management systems, or modifying case management systems. Adding new filing to case management system.</li> <li>• Would three months from Judicial Council approval of these proposals until their effective date provide sufficient time for implementation? Yes.</li> <li>• How well would these proposals work in courts of different sizes? It appears that the proposal would work for courts of various sizes.</li> </ul>	No response required.

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree.

**SP18-35****Protective Orders: Entry of Interstate and Tribal Protective Orders, Canadian Protective Orders, and Gun Violence Restraining Orders into CLETS; New Form for Registration of Canadian Domestic Violence Protective Orders; rule amendment to add Gun Violence Restraining Orders (Amend rules 1.51 and 2.503; adopt form DV-630)**

All comments are verbatim unless indicated by an asterisk (\*)

	<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Committee Response</b>
6.	TCPJAC/CEAC Joint Rules Subcommittee (JRS), Judicial Council of California	A	Recommended JRS Position: Agree with proposed changes.  The JRS notes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The rules and forms appear to be appropriate and necessary to achieve the stated goal.</li><li>• The three-month time frame is most likely an adequate amount of time to implement the rule.</li></ul>	No response required.

Positions: A = Agree; AM = Agree if modified; N = Do not agree.