



Boston Bar

ASSOCIATION

16 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

Phone (617) 742-0615
Fax (617) 523-0127
www.bostonbar.org

Officers

Lisa G. Arrowood
President
Carol A. Starkey
President-Elect
Mark D. Smith
Vice President
Christine M. Netski
Treasurer
Jonathan M. Albano
Secretary

Members of the Council

Russell Beck
Jacquelynne J. Bowman
Margaret A. Brown
Paul G. Cushing
June Duchesne
Jennifer Sevigney Durand
Michael C. Fee
Mark C. Fleming
Megan N. Gates
Lisa C. Goodheart
Hon. Margaret R. Hinkle (Ret.)
Julia Huston
Sarah Kim
Deborah J. Mantis
Christopher M. Morrison
Suma V. Nair
Kevin J. O'Connor
Karen O'Toole
Chinh H. Pham
Jeffrey J. Pyle
Elizabeth A. Ritvo
Mark D. Roellig
Rachael Rollins
David P. Rosenblatt
Vincent D. Rougeau
Sara J. Shanahan
David M. Siegel
Wendell C. Taylor
Laura M. Unflat

Past Presidents

Edward J. Barshak
Joseph W. Bartlett
Jack Cinquegrana
Paul T. Dacier
Gene D. Dahmen
Anthony M. Doniger
Thomas E. Dwyer, Jr.
Donald R. Frederico
Lisa C. Goodheart
Julia Huston
Hugh R. Jones, Jr.
Michael B. Keating
Renee M. Landers
Hon. Edward P. Leibensperger
Joan A. Lukey
Hon. Sandra L. Lynch
James J. Marcellino
Hon. Margaret H. Marshall (Ret.)
Edward I. Masterman
John A. Perkins
Rudolph F. Preece
Joel M. Reck
John J. Regan
Richard W. Renshan
Lauren Stiller Rikleen
Mary K. Ryan
James D. Smealie
Richard A. Soden
Kathy B. Weinman
Raymond A. Young

Christine P. Burak
Supreme Judicial Court
John Adams Courthouse
One Pemberton Square
Boston, MA 02108

October 13, 2015

Re: Comments on Proposed Amendments to Supreme Judicial Court Rule 1:24 – Personal Identifying Information

Dear Attorney Burak,

On behalf of the Boston Bar Association (BBA), I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments to Supreme Judicial Court (SJC) Rule 1:24 regarding personal identifying information.


The proposed amended rule was distributed to all BBA Sections. The BBA's Criminal Law, Delivery of Legal Services, and Family Law Sections discussed the issue at length and Section members proposed the attached comments. Please note that the enclosed document does not constitute or reflect a position of the BBA as a whole, but rather reflects the views of individual members of the aforementioned Sections. We hope that they may be useful to the SJC as it considers the proposed amendments.

The invitation to comment on this proposed amended rule inspired lengthy discussion in the Sections and BBA Council about the interplay of the entire SJC Rule 1:24 within the greater debate of online access to court records. As you are likely aware, the Trial Court Public Access to Court Records Committee (Committee) invited members of the public to comment concerning online access to court records at a hearing on June 15, 2015 in order to assist them in their formulation of a rule on this issue. The BBA submitted a letter urging for broad access, and explaining our interest in continuing to be part of the process. We look forward to another opportunity to comment on this issue once the Committee drafts a rule.

However, some members of the bar view SJC Rule 1:24 as intimately related to this process. If information is not redacted in initial filings under SJC Rule 1:24, it may become available online, which, depending on your perspective within the bar, is either a victory for open government, the media, constitutional law, and the public at large, or a loss for those who stand to have their personal information online. Privacy advocates are concerned that personal identifying information retrieved online would remain available in private hands regardless of the case outcome or if records are later sealed. They are concerned that this result would have a disparate impact on minority populations and be inconsistent with CORI. Others believe that imposing new limits on public access to court records would harm pro se litigants and raise constitutional issues by reducing the ability of the press and public to understand, report on, and oversee the judicial process. They also believe that privacy concerns are best addressed in the impoundment process and not by imposing new limitations on information used by courts and litigants. The BBA does not intend to take any position on this larger online access to court records debate in its comments on SJC 1:24.

Thank you for providing members of the bar with an opportunity to weigh in on these important proposed amendments, and please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or concerns.

Very truly yours,



Lisa Arrowood
President

**Comments of the Boston Bar Association’s Criminal Law, Delivery of Legal Services and Family Law Sections on Proposed New Supreme Judicial Court Rule 1:24, Personal Identifying Information
(10/13/15)**

In response to an invitation for comments from the Supreme Judicial Court (SJC) Standing Advisory Committee on the Rules of Civil and Appellate Procedure, the Boston Bar Association’s Criminal Law, Delivery of Legal Services, and Family Law Sections reviewed proposed new rule, SJC Rule 1:24, Personal Identifying Information.

- 1) Members of the Criminal, Family Law and Delivery of Legal Services Sections were generally supportive of the new rule but had varying views on the sanctions element in Section 9 whereby the court “may impose sanctions for noncompliance where appropriate.” All noted that the rule did not include any commentary on this section, that it was not part of the interim rule, and that it did not contain any standard for sanctioning.
- 2) Members of the Delivery of Legal Services Section agreed with the sanctioning authority and felt that it would effectively deter against the harm of unnecessary disclosure and/or have punitive effect for errors. However, the Section noted that adding guidance to the rule or adding a comment might help to clarify the type of cases to which the rule applies. The Section devised the following sample language:

“In determining the issue of sanctions, the court may consider whether the violation of this rule was knowing, whether harm to privacy interests or financial interests has occurred or is likely to occur from the improper disclosure, and the nature and amount of information improperly disclosed.”

This type of instruction makes clear the court has discretion and can decide whether to issue sanctions based on all the circumstances, but does not officially create a high standard and does not mandate graduated sanctions.

- 3) Members of the Family Law Section expressed concerns that by allowing for the possibility of sanctions simply by the motion of any party, pro se parties or unhappy attorneys could take advantage of the rule by filing for sanctions over innocent clerical redacting errors. It recommended adding a standard for sanctions or permitting them as part of a graduated process. Members recommended a standard of “willfully, intentionally, or with gross disregard for the intent of this rule.” Alternatively, permitting sanctions at the end of a graduated process would give parties the opportunity to correct mistakes before facing sanctions. For example, if the court or any party determines that a filed document was not redacted in accordance with the rule, the court shall require the responsible party to correct the redaction and refile the document. If the party refuses to refile the document or fails to correctly redact it, then the court may impose sanctions on

the filing party. Another alternative recommendation is to put the burden on the parties and require the person/entity concerned to draft a notice to the offending “filer,” similar to a Superior Court Rule 9 motion, and allow them an opportunity to reply/correct their error.

- 4) In addition, members of the Family and Criminal Law Sections had some concerns about Section 6, which excepts certain personal identifying information in criminal and youthful offender cases including the defendant’s social security number, driver’s license number, state-issued identification card number, or passport number, or the defendant’s parent’s birth name. Members of the Criminal Law section stated that social security numbers, in particular, are not typically available in criminal proceedings. Members of the Criminal Law and Family Law Sections suggested that the personal identifying information of accused defendants in criminal cases is also worthy of protection. Family Law Section members were concerned that these exceptions had the potential to subject individuals involved with the criminal justice system to identity theft or other harms after their cases have been resolved. Members of both sections suggested that Section 6(a) be either deleted or modified to prevent such harm. The BBA takes no position in these comments on issues related to online court access.
- 5) Members of the Criminal Law Section raised concerns that search warrants, and applications therefor, frequently contain private information that could later become available, after the end of the impoundment period. Although that is currently the case, it was felt that to leave that policy in place would be in conflict with the intent of these proposed changes. It was pointed out that while a judge may later order redactions to a warrant or application, no such opportunity is available if no charges are ultimately filed, or if the warrant does not issue. It was suggested that a requirement be added that the applying office be required to submit a copy of the application, affidavit and related materials, redacted in accordance with this Rule, when the warrant is sought or returned, which copy would then be publicly filed while the version containing personal identifying information remains impounded. This would be consistent with the procedure contemplated by the 2015 Amendments to Trial Court Rule VIII, Uniform Rules of Impoundment Procedure, Rules 3(e) & 8(c). The BBA takes no position on the subject of redacted search warrants.
- 6) Furthermore, members of the Criminal Law Section suggested that dates of birth be considered personal identifying information, inasmuch as they, too, can be used to perpetrate identity theft. It was noted that the cognate Federal rules (Civil Rule 5.2 and Criminal Rule 49.1) both require redaction of month and day of birth-dates in circumstances in which the rules do not provide an exemption from the redaction requirement.

