



## JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

# REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: October 27–28, 2016

---

Title

Criminal Procedure: Intercounty Probation  
and Mandatory Supervision Transfer

Agenda Item Type

Action Required

Effective Date

January 1, 2017

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected  
Amend Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.530

Date of Report

October 19, 2016

Recommended by

Criminal Law Advisory Committee  
Hon. Tricia Ann Bigelow, Chair

Contact

Kimberly DaSilva, 415-865-4534  
[kimberly.dasilva@jud.ca.gov](mailto:kimberly.dasilva@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

The Criminal Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council amend rule 4.530 of the California Rules of Court, which provides courts with procedures for implementing intercounty transfers of persons on probation and mandatory supervision pursuant to Penal Code section 1203.9. The proposed amendment would (1) clarify file transfer requirements after intercounty transfer under section 1203.9, and (2) make the rule consistent with Assembly Bill 673's amendments to section 1203.9.

### Recommendation

The Criminal Law Advisory Committee recommends that the Judicial Council amend California Rules of Court, rule 4.530, effective January 1, 2017, to:

1. Change the rule to require that after intercounty transfer under Penal Code section 1203.9:

- In all cases in which the supervisee is the sole defendant, the transferring court must transmit the entire *original* court file, except exhibits and records of payment, to the receiving court; and
  - If transfer is ordered in a case involving more than one defendant, the transferring court must transmit *certified copies* of the entire court file, except exhibits, to the receiving court.
2. Bring rule 4.530 into compliance with changes to Penal Code section 1203.9 regarding the collection and disbursement of court-ordered debt pursuant to Assembly Bill 673.

The text of the proposed amendment is attached at pages 7–9.

### **Previous Council Action**

At its June 24, 2016, business meeting, the Judicial Council approved Intercounty Probation Case Transfer Statewide Fiscal Procedures (Judicial Council Fiscal Procedures), effective July 1, 2016. These procedures govern the collection, accounting, and distribution of any outstanding court-ordered debt, which must be followed by the transferring and receiving court, county agency, or its authorized collection program for intercounty transfers of probation and mandatory supervision cases. A link to the Judicial Council Fiscal Procedures is included on page 6. These procedures will help implement the new jurisdictional requirements of Penal Code section 1203.9 regarding court-ordered debt.

### **Rationale for Recommendation**

As noted above, rule 4.530 establishes procedures for intercounty transfers of persons on probation or mandatory supervision pursuant to Penal Code section 1203.9.

### **File transfer requirements**

Rule 4.530(g)(5) currently requires a transferring court to transmit “the *entire court file* ... to the receiving court...” (Italics added.) And advisory committee comment to subdivision (g)(5) of the rule states that “[b]efore transmitting the court file, transferring courts should consider retaining copies of the court file in the event of an appeal or a writ.” The rule was designed to ensure that receiving courts are provided complete case information and that transferring courts do not incur the cost and burden of providing certified copies. Transferring courts, however, often require the original court file to adjudicate codefendant proceedings still pending at the time of transfer.

This proposal would amend rule 4.530(g)(5) to clarify that the transferring court must transmit the entire *original* court file except in cases involving codefendants. In cases involving codefendants, the proposal would instead require transferring courts to transmit *certified copies* of the entire court file. The proposal also would amend the related advisory committee comment to explain that transferring courts should retain the original court file for cases subject to the exception when necessary to properly adjudicate any pending or future codefendant proceedings.

## **Compliance with Assembly Bill 673 (collection and disbursement of court-ordered debt)**

AB 673, effective January 1, 2016, changed court jurisdiction over the collection and distribution of court-ordered debt after intercounty transfer. Although receiving courts continue to accept entire jurisdiction over cases transferred under Penal Code section 1203.9,<sup>1</sup> as of January 1, jurisdiction over the collection and disbursement of fines, forfeitures, penalties, assessments, and restitution ordered by the transferring court but not fully paid, remains with the transferring court unless the receiving court elects to collect and the transferring court approves the arrangement. Specifically, AB 673 made the following changes to Penal Code section 1203.9:

- Changed the effective date of transfer to the date the transferring court makes the order of transfer (subdivision (b)).
- Required courts to order that unpaid fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, assessments, or restitution at the time of transfer be paid by the defendant to the collection program for the transferring court for distribution and accounting once collected (subdivision (d)(1)).
- Allowed receiving courts and county probation departments to impose additional local fees and costs as authorized, and requires that they notify the collection program for the transferring court of those changes (subdivision (d)(2)).
- Required that local fees imposed by receiving courts and county probation departments be paid by the defendant to the collection program for the transferring court, which shall remit those fees and costs to the receiving court for accounting and distribution (subdivision (d)(3)).
- Allowed a receiving court, upon approval of the transferring court, to elect to collect all of the court-ordered payments from a defendant attributable to the case under which the defendant is being supervised and required that the receiving court's collection program transmit the revenue collected to the collection program for the transferring court for deposit, accounting, and distribution. In this situation, the collection program for the receiving court shall not charge administrative fees without a written agreement with the transferring court's collection program and the collection program for the receiving court, and the receiving court shall not report revenue owed or collected on behalf of the collection program for the transferring court in annual reports to the Judicial Council (subdivisions (e)(1), (2)).
- The bill also required that the Judicial Council consider the adoption of rules of court as it deems appropriate to implement the collection, accounting, and disbursement requirements of the bill (subdivision (g)).

This proposal would bring rule 4.530 into compliance with these changes to Penal Code section 1203.9 by amending it to:

---

<sup>1</sup> With the exception of jurisdiction over undetermined victim restitution, pursuant to section 1203.9, subdivision (a)(3), which also remains with the transferring court.

- Change the effective date of the transfer to the date of the transfer order;
- Require the transferring court to retain records of payment upon transfer of the court file to the receiving court;
- Require the probation officer of the transferring county to retain records of payment upon transfer of the file to the receiving county;
- Delete the two-week holding period of the transferring court and probation files on the transferred case;
- Add a subdivision detailing the new jurisdictional requirements regarding court-ordered debt; and,
- Require court collection, accounting, and disbursement of court-ordered debt procedures to be consistent with Judicial Council fiscal procedures located on the “Budget and Finance” page of the Judicial Council website.

### **Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications**

This proposal circulated for public comment during the spring 2016 cycle. A total of five comments were received; four of those comments contained multiple questions and/or suggestions. A chart with all comments received and the committee’s responses is attached at pages 10–17.

Two commentators directly addressed the file transfer portion of the proposal. The Superior Court of Orange County submitted three comments on this portion. The court first suggested that the proposal address electronic records. The Judicial Council is currently in the process of modernizing its rules and forms to make them consistent with modern e-business practices. This includes a Rules Modernization Project, led by the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC). The committee will work with ITAC on developments appropriate for the California Rules of Court related to criminal procedure.

Second, the court suggested adding language to clarify that, in multiple defendant cases, only documents related to the transferring defendant need to be transmitted to the receiving court. The committee agreed with the suggestion and added language to that effect in an advisory comment. The court’s third suggestion on the file transfer portion of the proposal noted an inconsistency between multiple and single defendant cases in the amount of time the transferring court had to transmit the file to the receiving court. The committee made the time period consistent for both types of cases by deleting the “two weeks” transfer period for codefendant cases in subdivision (g)(5) and replacing it with a requirement that the file transfer occur “upon transfer” as required for single defendant cases in subdivision (g)(3).

Also, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County commented that the requirement in multiple defendant cases—that the transferring court keep the original file and send certified copies to the receiving court—would create more work for the court. It also noted, however, that it did not know how often that would occur. The committee anticipates that the increased workload would not be significant.

Only one of the comments directly addressed the AB 673 compliance portion of the proposal. That comment stated that the circulated proposal did not specifically address the situation in their county, where the supervisees typically paid their court-ordered debt to the county probation department, not to the court's collections department. The comment recommended adding clarifying language to support other entities collecting payments ordered by the court. The committee agreed with this comment and has added an advisory comment to subdivision (h), clarifying that court collections programs may include county probation departments.

Three commentators also addressed a third proposed amendment to rule 4.530 that was included in the proposal as circulated in the spring 2016 cycle. That proposed amendment to rule 4.530 would have required receiving courts to notify transferring courts when the receiving court either reduced a felony to a misdemeanor or dismissed a transferred case. One of the comments included a concern about the increased workload it would put on the courts. After discussion, the committee decided that the anticipated burden on the courts would outweigh the utility of this particular portion of the proposal as circulated. While not recommending that the Judicial Council adopt this third portion of the proposal at this time, the committee may consider other means, including working with other advisory bodies, to develop a less burdensome method of ensuring that transferring court records accurately reflect when a case has been transferred.

### **Internal comments**

Since this proposal was circulated for public comment there have been two Court of Appeal decisions addressing whether petitions for recall of sentences under Proposition 47, filed after an intercounty transfer, should be filed in the transferring court or the receiving court. Both courts recognized the conflict between Penal Code section 1170.18(a) (Prop. 47) and section 1203.9 (intercounty transfers). In *People v. Curry* (2106) 1 Cal.App.5th 1073, the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, held that section 1170.18(a) controls and that petitions for recall must be filed in the sentencing court. (*ibid.*) In contrast, *People v. Adelman*, Cal. Ct. App., Aug. 31, 2016, (2016 WL 4538437), decided after *Curry*, resolves that same issue in favor of section 1203.9, holding that petitions for recall of sentences under Prop. 47 are properly filed in the receiving court. The committee considered whether any changes to the file transfer portion of the proposal were needed in light of these two decisions. Ultimately, it decided to recommend the proposal without changes. The cases do not undermine the proposal because they provide limited guidance on the narrow issue of where to file petitions for recall of sentences under Prop. 47. The proposal is important to advance at this time to provide clarity to transferring courts that they are to transmit their original file to the receiving court, retaining it and sending a certified copy only in multiple-defendant cases.

The committee is also in the process of developing a legislative proposal to amend section 1203.9. The proposal would authorize a receiving court to refer a particular hearing or other proceeding back to the transferring court for the limited purpose of conducting the proceeding if the receiving court determines, based upon the geographic location of the parties, victims, witnesses, evidence, or for any other reason, that it would be more appropriate for the matter to

be conducted by the transferring court. By including the provision to permit referral of the case back to the transferring county “for any other reason,” the committee intends to cover the Prop. 47 situation regardless of whether or how the Supreme Court resolves the issue.

## **Alternatives**

One alternative to moving forward with both portions of the proposal is to approve the AB 673 compliance portion of the proposal and decline approval of the file transfer portion of the proposal in order to wait and see if the California Supreme Court will resolve the apparent split of authority between *Curry* and *Adelmann*. The committee considered this alternative but decided to move ahead with the file transfer portion given the current split among the courts, and to address any necessary changes if future case law requires it.

## **Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts**

Minimal staff training is anticipated for the file transfer clarification. However, staff training required for compliance with AB 673 may be significant given the new Judicial Council Fiscal Procedures. Unfortunately, this is unavoidable due to the change in the law.

## **Attachments and Links**

1. Cal. Rules of Court, rule 4.530, with proposed amendments, at pages 7–9
2. Judicial Council-approved Intercounty Probation Case Transfer Statewide Fiscal Procedures  
<https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=4494246&GUID=F0163E08-393E-4F3B-99D6-86FA33DC2176>
3. Chart of comments, at pages 10–17
4. Assembly Bill 673  
[http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201520160AB673](http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB673)

Rule 4.530 of the California Rules of Court is amended, effective January 1, 2017, to read:

**Rule 4.530. Intercounty transfer of probation and mandatory supervision cases**

**(a)–(f) \* \* \***

**(g) Transfer**

- (1) If the transferring court determines that the permanent residence of the supervised person is in the county of the receiving court, the transferring court must transfer the case unless it determines that transfer would be inappropriate and states its reasons on the record.
- (2) To the extent possible, the transferring court must establish any amount of restitution owed by the supervised person before it orders the transfer.
- (3) Transfer is effective the date the transferring court orders the transfer. Upon transfer of the case, the receiving court must accept the entire jurisdiction over the case.
- (4) The orders for transfer must include an order committing the supervised person to the care and custody of the probation officer of the receiving county and an order for reimbursement of reasonable costs for processing the transfer to be paid to the county of the transferring court in accordance with Penal Code section 1203.1b.
- (5) Upon transfer of the case, the transferring court must transmit any records of payments and the entire original court file, except exhibits, to the receiving court within two weeks of the transfer order in all cases in which the supervisee is the sole defendant, except the transferring court shall not transfer (A) exhibits or (B) any records of payments. If transfer is ordered in a case involving more than one defendant, the transferring court must transmit certified copies of the entire original court file, except exhibits and any records of payments, to the receiving court upon transfer of the case.
- (6) Upon transfer the probation officer of the transferring county must transmit, at a minimum, any court orders, probation or mandatory supervision reports, and case plans, ~~and all records of payments~~ to the probation officer of the receiving county ~~within two weeks of the transfer order.~~
- (7) Upon transfer of the case, the probation officer of the transferring county must notify the supervised person of the transfer order. The supervised person must report to the probation officer of the receiving county no later than 30 days after transfer unless the transferring court orders the supervised person to report sooner. If the supervised person is in custody at the time of

transfer, the supervised person must report to the probation officer of the receiving county no later than 30 days after being released from custody unless the transferring court orders the supervised person to report sooner. Any jail sentence imposed as a condition of probation or mandatory supervision prior to transfer must be served in the transferring county unless otherwise authorized by law.

**(h) Court-ordered debt**

**(1) In accordance with Penal Code section 1203.9(d) and (e):**

**(A) If the transferring court has ordered the defendant to pay fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, assessments, or restitution, the transfer order must require that those and any other amounts ordered by the transferring court that are still unpaid at the time of transfer be paid by the defendant to the collection program for the transferring court for proper distribution and accounting once collected.**

**(B) The receiving court and receiving county probation department may impose additional local fees and costs as authorized.**

**(C) Upon approval of a transferring court, a receiving court may elect to collect all of the court-ordered payments from a defendant attributable to the case under which the defendant is being supervised.**

**(2) Policies and procedures for implementation of the collection, accounting, and disbursement of court-ordered debt under this rule must be consistent with Judicial Council fiscal procedures available at [www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov).**

**Advisory Committee Comment**

Subdivision (g)(5) requires the transferring court to transmit the entire original court file, except exhibits and any records of payments, to the court of the receiving county in all cases in which the supervisee is the sole defendant. Before transmitting the entire original court file, transferring courts should consider retaining copies of the court file in the event of an appeal or a writ. In cases involving more than one defendant, subdivision (g)(5) requires the transferring court to transmit certified copies of the entire original court file to ensure that transferring courts are able to properly adjudicate any pending or future codefendant proceedings. Only documents related to the transferring defendant must be transmitted to the receiving court.

Subdivision (g)(7) clarifies that any jail sentence imposed as a condition of probation or mandatory supervision before transfer must be served in the transferring county unless otherwise



1 authorized by law. For example, Penal Code section 1208.5 authorizes the boards of supervisors  
2 of two or more counties with work furlough programs to enter into agreements to allow work-  
3 furlough-eligible persons sentenced to or imprisoned in one county jail to transfer to another  
4 county jail.

5  
6 Subdivision (h) requires defendants still owing fines, fees, forfeitures, penalties, assessments, or  
7 restitution to pay the transferring court's collection program. In counties where the county  
8 probation department collects this court-ordered debt, the term "collection program" is intended  
9 to include the county probation department.

## SPR16-12

### Criminal Procedure: Intercounty Probation and Mandatory Supervision Transfer (Amend rule 4.530)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
1.	Albert De La Isla Principal Administrative Analyst Superior Court of California, Orange County	N/I	<p>In addition to comments on the proposal as a whole, the advisory committee is interested in comments on the following:</p> <p>•Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose?</p> <p>(1) Response: For courts that maintain an electronic record, there should be language relating to electronic records and being able to send those records electronically and also document that successful receipt for records electronically as well as currently being done with Orange County, Los Angeles and Riverside.</p> <p>(2) Also, there should be clarifying language that only documents related to the transferring defendant (on multiple defendant cases) need to be transmitted to the receiving court.</p> <p>(3) Subsection (g) (3) specifies that if approved, a transfer will be effective the date the transferring court orders the transfer.</p>	<p>(1) This comment is addressed to the proposal clarifying file transfer procedures. The Judicial Council is currently in the process of modernizing its rules and forms to make them consistent with modern e-business practices. In some instances, such as electronic criminal case environments, legislative proposals may precede rule and form amendments. That project, the Rules Modernization Project, is led by the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) This committee will work with ITAC on developments appropriate for the California Rules of Court related to criminal procedure.</p> <p>(2) This comment is addressed to the proposal clarifying file transfer procedures. The committee agrees with the suggestion to clarify that only documents related to the transferring defendant must be transmitted to the receiving court and has added language to that effect in an advisory comment.</p> <p>3) This comment is addressed to the proposal clarifying file transfer procedures. The committee considered this comment, deleted the “two</p>

## SPR16-12

### Criminal Procedure: Intercounty Probation and Mandatory Supervision Transfer (Amend rule 4.530)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>Subsection (g)(5) further states that if the case involves more than one defendant, the original file must be transmitted to the receiving court within two weeks. However, there is no specific timeframe within which the case must be transmitted if there is only one defendant. We recommend that the rule provide consistent language for either type of case transmittal.</p> <p>(4) Proposed new subsection (h) requires a receiving court to notify the transferring court when the supervised person's conviction is reduced from a felony to a misdemeanor, or there is some other disposition of the supervised person's case. Since legislation was approved by the voters of California in November 2014, many cases have had reductions of felony convictions to misdemeanors under Proposition 47. The legislation enacted pursuant to the Proposition, PC 1170.18, sunsets this provision in 2017 unless the court is provided a showing of good cause. Will there be a retroactive component of the notification requirement in cases where reductions of charges have already taken place, if practicable?</p> <p>Language should be added to subsection (h) which allows notification from one court to another, whether an action on the case was initiated at the transferring or receiving court. As to the notification component, if courts are required to undertake the retroactive updating of cases it will require a large commitment of</p>	<p>weeks" transfer period for co-defendant cases in subdivision (g)(5) and replaced it with a requirement that the file transfer occur "upon transfer" as required for single defendant cases in subdivision (g)(3).</p> <p>(4) The committee is not recommending the notification portion of the proposal. However, the committee may consider other means, including working with other advisory bodies, to develop a less burdensome method of ensuring that transferring court records accurately reflect when a case has been transferred.</p>

## SPR16-12

### Criminal Procedure: Intercounty Probation and Mandatory Supervision Transfer (Amend rule 4.530)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>resources. However, it does make sense to do this, particularly for Proposition 47 cases, in order to provide a consistent and accurate case record for this sizeable population.</p> <p>(5) Proposed new subsection (i) indicates that monies previously ordered and still owing at the time of the transfer will be paid by the defendant to the collection program for the transferring court unless an agreement exists that the receiving court will collect payment from the defendant. Since cases transferred pursuant to PC 1203.9 are typically on formal probation and mandatory supervision, any fines, fees, or other money ordered is collected through Orange County's Probation Department, not the court's Collections Department. Recommend adding clarifying language to support other entities that are collecting payments ordered by the court.</p> <p>The advisory committee also seeks comments from courts on the following cost and implementation matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Would the proposal provide cost savings? If so please quantify.</li></ul> <p>(6) Response: No.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•What would the implementation requirements be for courts? For example, training staff (please identify position and expected hours of</li></ul>	<p>(5) This comment is addressed to the proposal for rule compliance with Assembly Bill 673. Both this subdivision and Penal Code section 1203.9, as amended, allow for collection by either the court or the court's collection program. The committee has added an advisory comment to this subdivision, clarifying that court collections programs may include county probation departments.</p> <p>(6) No response required.</p>

## SPR16-12

### Criminal Procedure: Intercounty Probation and Mandatory Supervision Transfer (Amend rule 4.530)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			<p>training), revising processes and procedures (please describe), changing docket codes in case management systems, or modifying case management systems.</p> <p>(7) Response: Procedure changes, training of staff (minimal), docket code changes to update the court record for cases that are transferred and were ultimately reduced to misdemeanors or dismissed. Also creation of a form to notify transferring courts when the receiving court modifies the Felony record, and the creation of docket codes to capture the noticing process in the minutes.</p> <p>•Would 2 months from Judicial Council approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation?</p> <p>(8) Response: 3 – 4 months</p> <p>•How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes?</p> <p>(9) Response: Unknown, depends on their level of automation.</p>	<p>(7) The committee is not recommending the notification portion of the proposal. However, the committee may consider other means, including working with other advisory bodies, to develop a less burdensome method of ensuring that transferring court records accurately reflect when a case has been transferred.</p> <p>(8) The committee has considered this and, in the absence of a request for a longer implementation period from other courts, declines this suggestion.</p> <p>(9) No response required.</p>
2.	Orange County Bar Association By Todd Friedland	A		No response required.

## SPR16-12

### Criminal Procedure: Intercounty Probation and Mandatory Supervision Transfer (Amend rule 4.530)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
	President			
3.	Superior Court of California, Los Angeles	A	<p>This proposal is to (1) clarify file transfer requirements after intercounty transfer under Penal Code section 1203.9, (2) require receiving courts to notify transferring courts when the receiving court either reduces a felony to a misdemeanor or dismisses a case after transfer, and (3) make the rule consistent with Assembly Bill 673's amendments to section 1203.9.</p> <p>(1) The first proposal clarifies that the entire original file must be transferred except exhibits, and recommends that the transferring court keep a copy for future writ purposes. When there are co-defendants, however, the transferring court should keep the original file and send certified copies. That is certainly more work and expense for the transferring court, we are not sure how common this would be.</p> <p>(2) The second proposal is that the receiving court advise the transferring court if a felony is reduced or a charge dismissed so that the transferring court's docket reflects current accurate information, and helps to prevent incomplete information from affecting employment and benefit eligibility. This also would involve more work for both courts but again it is difficult to determine how often this happens.</p>	<p>(1) This comment is addressed to the proposal clarifying file transfer procedures. The committee acknowledges that this proposal may create more work but anticipates that the increased workload will not be significant.</p> <p>2) The committee is not recommending the notification portion of the proposal. However, the committee may consider other means, including working with other advisory bodies, to develop a less burdensome method of ensuring that transferring court records accurately reflect when a case has been transferred.</p>

## SPR16-12

### Criminal Procedure: Intercounty Probation and Mandatory Supervision Transfer (Amend rule 4.530)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			(3) The third proposal merely makes conforming changes to the rules. We agree with modifications to status updates for transferred cases; agree in full that the transferring court should retain jurisdiction over the collection and disbursement of fines, forfeitures, penalties, assessments, and restitution ordered but not fully paid at the time of transfer. A uniform mechanism for notification of significant changes in case status to the transferring court by the receiving court should be instituted prior to implementation.	
4.	Superior Court of California, County of San Diego by Mike Roddy Executive Officer	A	(1) Q: Does the proposal appropriately address the stated purpose? Yes  (2) Q: Would the proposal provide cost savings? No. It is anticipated that there may be an insignificant increase of use of staff time.  (3) Q: What are implementations requirements for courts? Create a procedure for notifying other courts. Suggestion is for the receiving court to send a completed copy of the JUS 8715 to the sending court. It is also recommended that the responsibility of notifying the DOJ of subsequent actions fall on the receiving court.  (4) Q: Would two months from JC approval of this proposal until its effective date provide sufficient time for implementation? Yes	(1) No response required.  (2) No response required.  (3) The committee is not recommending the notification portion of the proposal. However, the committee may consider other means, including working with other advisory bodies, to develop a less burdensome method of ensuring that transferring court records accurately reflect when a case has been transferred.  (4) No response required.

## SPR16-12

### Criminal Procedure: Intercounty Probation and Mandatory Supervision Transfer (Amend rule 4.530)

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

	Commentator	Position	Comment	Committee Response
			(5) Q: How well would this proposal work in courts of different sizes? No issue in large or small courts.	(5) No response required.
5.	Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Court Executives Advisory Committee Joint Rules Subcommittee	A	General Note: This proposal should be implemented because it would provide better access to information for the public and justice partners.  Regarding increases to court staff's workload: A small increase in court staff workload is anticipated, but this increase is only a minor concern.	No response required.