

**NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION
COMMERCIAL AND FEDERAL LITIGATION SECTION
COMMENT ON AMENDMENT TO
COMMERCIAL DIVISION RULE 32¹**

SUMMARY

The Administrative Board of the New York Courts (the “Administrative Board”) has requested comments on a proposed amendment to Commercial Division Rule 32 proffered by the Commercial Division Advisory Council (“CDAC”) (the “Amendment”). The Commercial and Federal Litigation Section of the New York State Bar Association (the “Section”) recommends that the proposed rule amendments be adopted, as further explained below.

COMMENT

I. OVERVIEW

The Section is comprised of a wide cross-section of practitioners, including members in the private and public sectors, solo practitioners, and members of small, mid-size, and large law firms, who litigate both civil and criminal bench and jury trials in state and federal courts in New York and throughout the country. Thus, in offering the following comments, the Section is drawing upon a broad range of experience.

II. PROPOSED AMENDMENT

A. Current Version of Rule 32

Rule 32. Scheduling of witnesses. At the pre-trial conference or at such time as the court may direct, each party shall identify in writing for the court the witnesses it intends to call, the order in which they shall testify and the estimated length of their testimony, and shall provide a copy of such witness list to opposing counsel. Counsel shall separately identify for the court only a list of the witnesses who may be called solely for rebuttal or with regard to credibility.

B. Proposed Version of Rule 32

Rule 32. Scheduling of witnesses. At the pre-trial conference or at such time as the court may direct, each party shall identify in writing for the court the witnesses it intends to call, the order in which they shall testify, ~~and~~ the estimated length of their testimony **and whether the witness will testify in person or through the use of video technology**, and shall provide a copy of such witness list to opposing counsel. Counsel shall separately identify for the court **only (and not to be exchanged with other counsel)** a list of the witnesses who may be called solely for rebuttal or with regard to credibility.

¹ Opinions expressed in this Memorandum are those of the Section and do not represent the opinions of the New York State Bar Association unless and until the Memorandum has been adopted by the Association’s House of Delegates or Executive Committee.

C. **CDAC Rational for Revision**

The Advisory Council recommends Rule 32 be modified to allow for the identification of witnesses whose testimony may be taken at trial by the use of video technology. The Advisory Council further recommends Rule 32 be modified to affirmatively state that rebuttal witnesses must only be identified to the court, not exchanged with other counsel.

D. **Section's Position**

The Section supports the proposed amendments as there is a need in Rule 32 to acknowledge that trial testimony of a witness may not always be in person, and that opposing counsel and the court need to be apprised in advance of such means of testimony. In addition, the proposed amendment properly makes explicit what had been implicit that the list of potential rebuttal witnesses need only be provided to the court and need not be exchanged with opposing counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

New York State Bar Association
Commercial and Federal Litigation Section
Ignatius A. Grande, Section Chair

December 30, 2022

Approved by the Commercial & Federal Litigation Section Executive Committee, December 14, 2022

Commercial Division Committee
Mark A. Berman,* Co-Chair
Ralph Carter, Co-Chair

*Denotes Principal Author of the Comment



NEW YORK
CITY BAR

January 25, 2023

**COUNCIL ON JUDICIAL
ADMINISTRATION**

FRAN HOFFINGER
CHAIR
Phone: (212) 421-4000
fhoffinger@hoffingerlaw.com

LITIGATION COMMITTEE

SETH D. ALLEN
CHAIR
Phone : (212) 344-5400
sallen@schlamstone.com

**STATE COURTS OF SUPERIOR
JURISDICTION COMMITTEE**

AMY D. CARLIN
CHAIR
Phone : (212) 530-4835
acarlin@lhrqb.com

By Email

Anthony R. Perri, Esq.
Counsel
Office of Court Administration
25 Beaver Street, 11th Floor
New York, NY 100041
rulecomments@nycourts.gov

Re: New York City Bar Association Response to Request for Public Comment on Proposal to Amend Commercial Division Rules 28, 29, and 32

Dear Mr. Perri:

We write to provide comments with respect to the Request for Public Comment on Amending Commercial Division Rules 28, 29, and 32.

The New York City Bar Association's Council on Judicial Administration, State Courts of Superior Jurisdiction, and Litigation Committees have considered and discussed the proposed rule changes. We support the proposed revisions to Rule 29 and propose minor revisions to Rules 28 and 32.

About the Association

The mission of the New York City Bar Association, which was founded in 1870 and has over 23,000 members, is to equip and mobilize a diverse legal profession to practice with excellence, promote reform of the law, and uphold the rule of law and access to justice in support of a fair society and the public interest in our community, our nation, and throughout the world.

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
42 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036
212.382.6600 | www.nycbar.org

We are in favor of the proposed amendment to Rule 28. However, we would like to address two concerns with the Rule (one of which is not caused by the proposed change). The proposed Rule 28 states that “[e]xhibits not previously identified which are to be used solely for credibility or rebuttal need not be premarked.” The proposed Rule 29 states that it does not apply to deposition testimony “to be used solely for impeachment or credibility purposes.” We think these rules should be made consistent, such that Rule 28 should add “impeachment” to the purposes for which exhibits need not be pre-marked. We also believe that only exhibits actually offered at trial should be deemed marked into evidence. Accordingly, we propose the modifications set forth below.

Counsel for the parties shall consult prior to the pre-trial conference and shall in good faith attempt to agree upon the exhibits that will be offered into evidence without objection and shall premark all exhibits as to which no objection has been made for introduction into evidence. Counsel shall also mark all exhibits not consented to for identification only. Counsel asserting objections to the introduction of any proposed exhibit shall be prepared to state the objection with specificity at the pretrial conference or such other time as the court directs. The premarked exhibits as to which there is no dispute and which are offered at trial shall be marked into evidence, unless the court directs otherwise. If the trial exhibits are voluminous or in a digital or other format that creates practical marking issues, counsel shall consult the clerk of the part for guidance. Exhibits not previously identified which are to be used solely for impeachment, credibility or rebuttal need not be premarked.

With respect to the proposed amendment to Commercial Division Rule 32, we propose one modification set forth below.

Rule 32. Scheduling of witnesses. At the pre-trial conference or at such time as the court may direct, each party shall identify in writing for the court the witnesses it intends to call, the order in which they shall testify, and the estimated length of their testimony and whether the witness will testify in person or, if permitted and subject to objection, through the use of video technology, and shall provide a copy of such witness list to opposing counsel. Counsel shall separately identify for the court only (and not to be exchanged with other counsel) a list of the witnesses who may be called solely for rebuttal or with regard to credibility.

We propose this addition so that the rule does not imply that witnesses may *automatically* be permitted to testify virtually, given the conditions set forth in Commercial Division Rule 36.

Although we support these three rule changes, with the aforementioned minor modifications, we must express many of our committee members’ concerns with the proliferation of rules across the Court system. In a Commercial Division case, a practitioner needs to consider, at minimum: (i) the CPLR; (ii) the Uniform Rules for the Supreme Court and County Court; (iii) the Commercial Division Rules; and (iv) the Part Rules of the assigned Justice. In recent years, it appears that there are both more rules and that the rules are constantly changing. For example, prior to February 2021, a litigant in the non-commercial part would not need to submit a statement of material undisputed facts in support of a summary judgment motion. In February 2021, Uniform Rule 202.8-g was amended to require such a statement. Subsequently, in July of 2022, Administrative Order 141/22 (“AO 141/22”), eliminated the requirement for such a statement

unless the Court so-directs. As such, litigants must now look to the Part Rules to determine whether such a statement is required. This is but one example.

The frequent rule changes and propagation of rules by various authorities has complicated the practice of law and is increasingly a burden on practitioners. Although we adopt the proposed rule changes discussed herein, we invite stakeholders in the Court System to consider ways to minimize this burden – by reducing the frequency of new rules and amendments and by creating uniformity in rules across the Court System wherever possible.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you believe that it would be beneficial, we would be happy to discuss these comments with you further.

Respectfully submitted,

Fran Hoffinger, Chair
Council on Judicial Administration

Seth D. Allen, Chair
Litigation Committee

Amy D. Carlin, Chair
State Courts of Superior Jurisdiction