

HONORABLE JACQUELINE W. SILBERMANN

2001 - 2008

Justice Jacqueline W. Silberman was the Administrative Judge of Supreme Court, Civil Branch, New York County from 2001 through 2008. She simultaneously carried statewide administrative responsibilities, as Statewide Administrative Judge for Matrimonial Matters and later Deputy Chief Administrative Judge for Matrimonial Matters. She served in this role for ten years.

Judge Silberman was fated to preside over the court during and in the aftermath of the catastrophe suffered by the City at the hands of terrorists on September 11, 2001. She was in the court on that day and, after consultation with the Central Administration, ordered the closure of the court and directed the public, attorneys present, Judges, and staff to walk north to safer ground. The court was closed for a few days. But Judge Silberman and the leadership of the Unified Court System recognized the importance of the court's reopening as soon as possible. And so the court was quickly back in business, thereby demonstrating that the administration of justice would not be stilled by fear or threat.

This was not, however, an easy time for the court, as the smell of smoke permeated the area around the New York County Courthouse, located only a few blocks from the World Trade Center. During these difficult days, Judge Silberman set a tone of professionalism and provided calm and steady leadership for the court and all who worked here, as indeed she did throughout her tenure.

Judge Silberman received her law degree *cum laude* from Fordham University School of Law in 1972 after having obtained her undergraduate degree *cum laude* from Bryn Mawr College in 1959. The Judge worked as an associate at Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom. Later she served as a Law Secretary to Civil Court Judge Irving Smith and to Supreme Court Justices Joseph R. Marro and Jacob Grumet. She became a Judge of the Civil Court in 1984. Her administrative skills were recognized early. From 1987 to 1989, she was the Supervising Judge of the Civil Court of New York County. She became a Supreme Court Justice by Designation in 1986 and was elected to the Supreme Court four years later. She was appointed Administrative Judge of the Civil Court of the City of New York in March 1989 and continued in that role until 1996. In January 1997, Judge Silberman became Statewide Administrative Judge for Matrimonial Matters. She became the Administrative Judge of Supreme Court, Civil Branch, New York County in March 2001.



Hon. Jacqueline W. Silberman
Administrative Judge

As Administrative Judge for the Supreme Court, Civil Branch, New York County, Judge Silbermann carried on and developed initiatives that had begun under her predecessors and undertook many programs of her own.

When Judge Silbermann became Administrative Judge of Supreme Court, Civil Branch, New York County, the electronic filing program was still in its infancy. The court was seeking ways to increase the number of e-filed matters. Among the various steps undertaken was an effort directed to tax certiorari cases in New York County. The court system, at the initiative of Judge Silbermann's court, developed a special modified e-filing module for tax certiorari cases. This was done in recognition of the facts that the initiating papers in these cases are formulaic, large numbers of these filings are made by a comparatively small number of law firms, and the adversary is the same. The Unified Court System Division of Technology and the e-filing team developed the module so that the filing of documents in these cases could be made very simply and efficiently. The team worked with the City and the Bar and reasonable procedures were agreed upon that materially helped the attorneys and the City to handle this large volume of filings electronically. Later, the module was enhanced significantly so that initial filings could be created and e-filed through the uploading of a text file to the e-filing system, which very notably increased the efficiency of the process for all involved. Thus, in 2004, Judge Silbermann was able to report that New York County had seen over 6,000 e-filed case filings during the tax certiorari filing season in 2003, which amounted to a 30-fold increase over the rate of filings in 2002.

This progress thereafter expanded to the Supreme Courts elsewhere in New York City. Further work was done on the module so as to allow it to accommodate SCAR filings, of which there are a large number each year in Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties. Within a few years, the large majority of the SCAR filings in these counties and the large majority of tax certiorari filings in New York City were made through the e-filing system. Over 100,000 SCAR cases have been e-filed in Nassau County alone since 2009 based upon the work undertaken here.

The great improvement that occurred in e-filing at this time through the work on tax certiorari and SCAR filings had further beneficial consequences for the e-filing program generally. The tax certiorari module formed a technical foundation for modules created for use in other courts, such as the Surrogate's Court.

Judge Silbermann took a number of other steps to increase e-filing in this court. For example, she and the Commercial Division Justices announced that, although e-filing was voluntary, Division cases would presumptively be considered e-filed matters. A similar approach was followed in a number of other Parts, as a result of which certain Parts received a high percentage of e-filed cases among the matters assigned to them.

Judge Silbermann had another important impact on e-filing in New York State. She, along with the Chief Clerk and Executive Officer of the court, John F. Werner, Esq., recommended to the Office of Court Administration the appointment of Jeffrey Carucci as Statewide Coordinator for Electronic Filing upon the untimely passing of Amy Vance, Esq., who had initially led the effort. Mr. Carucci, a former court officer and longtime clerk at the court, was assigned to this role by the Unified Court System and this appointment has had a tremendously beneficial, indeed decisive, effect on the e-filing program in New York ever since.

Not long after Judge Silbermann retired, the court system introduced mandatory e-filing in certain kinds of cases. Since then there has been a very large growth in e-filing. To date, almost 2 million cases have been e-filed in New York and the program continues to expand, most recently to the Appellate Divisions statewide.

When Judge Silbermann became Administrative Judge, the Commercial Division was about five years old. She supported and nourished its growth and improvement over the years of her tenure. Among other things, she arranged for and promoted training for mediators for the Commercial Division Alternative Dispute Resolution Program. She personally participated in the training sessions by introducing them and explaining their important place in the Commercial Division. She also energetically sought to encourage the Division Justices to refer cases to the ADR Program, often meeting with them and sending memoranda to them in this effort.

In the last year of her tenure, Part 146 of the Rules of the Chief Administrative Judge was promulgated. This Part, entitled “Guidelines for Qualifications and Training of ADR Neutrals Serving on Court Rosters,” set forth training requirements for those who would serve as mediators and other neutrals on court rosters. Under the Part, mediators shall have completed 40 hours of approved training, 24 hours in basic mediation skills and techniques and 16 hours of additional training in the specific mediation techniques pertaining to commercial disputes. Judge Silbermann communicated with the mediators on the Commercial Division ADR Roster about Part 146 and put into place the court’s response to the enactment of the Part. The processes she set in motion have led to a roster of mediators with greatly increased levels of training and mediation experience.

As had her predecessors, Judge Silbermann concerned herself with case management and efforts to improve efficiency in the court. She spent much time and energy addressing case management questions and undertaking initiatives to improve case management, reduce delay, and promote the resolution of post-note cases. She issued a Second Edition of the *Handbook on Case Management*, which set forth suggested procedures for handling inventories in the court with the greatest possible efficiency. The *Handbook* can also be viewed as a statement of the case management aspirations of the court, goals that should guide Judges and court staff as they process cases through the court. She reviewed and modified operations of the Administrative Coordinating Part (Part 40), from

which cases are assigned out for trial. She assigned Honorable Ira Gammerman to preside over the Part. His tenure as the Administrative Coordinating Judge proved to be extremely productive. Backlogs of City cases and other matters were dramatically reduced. Delay in the processing of post-note cases declined and the number of trials commenced increased. In 2006, for example, with over 35,000 cases pending, the court disposed of 7,667 notes of issue, disposed of 20,735 pre-note cases, and commenced 1,249 trials.

Building upon Judge Crane's work, Judge Silbermann promoted a comprehensive case management approach. Working with the City and the plaintiff's Bar through the Tort Advisory Committee, the court developed a standardized form of discovery order in City cases, which was issued by the court without need for an appearance by the parties. A similar order was also developed for motor vehicle cases. Opportunities were provided for conferences in the event of disputes. These discovery efforts were promoted instead of motion practice, which cost the plaintiff money and consumed time of City attorneys that could better be spent in trial preparation.

An important element of the approach pursued by Judge Crane and Judge Silbermann was to offer the parties opportunities to discuss settlement after the filing of the note of issue at a point when the case would otherwise sit on a list waiting to advance to trial. Judge William Leibovitz was assigned to confer with the parties shortly after the filing of the note of issue. He would review discovery to be sure that the case was indeed ready for trial. He also explored settlement with the parties.

Further, Judge Silbermann expanded a Neutral Evaluation Program (informally known as "Mediation") for post-note cases. Since most post-note cases settled before trial, her thought, like that of her predecessor, Judge Crane, who established the program, was that active intervention by a skilled evaluator after the note of issue was filed might lead to settlements before cases reached the jury room for selection, at which point jurors would be inconvenienced needlessly if they were to be placed on a case that would settle shortly thereafter. (At this time, Chief Judge Judith S. Kaye was promoting her jury reforms, one objective of which was to make jury service more productive and meaningful for jurors.) Cases were sent to Mediation after their appearance before Judge Leibovitz and as they approached appearance in Part 40. Michael McAlister, Esq. was appointed the first Evaluator. Mr. McAlister was very successful in his efforts, which contributed to the reduction in the statistics on delay in the resolution of post-note cases. After a time, Judge Silbermann added a second Evaluator.

In City cases, the City committed itself to providing a certain number of trial attorneys each week. Trial-ready City cases were given what was called a "Last Clear Chance Conference," which was the last court-sponsored opportunity for settlement discussions before the case was sent to trial; if the parties failed to come to settlement at that conference, they would appear in Part 40 City, where there would be no settlement discussions, and be sent out for jury selection exactly one week later without fail. The court organized its calendars in such a way that cases came on for trial in

numbers sufficient to keep the City's trial counsel engaged but not overextended. Doing this, using the Last Clear Chance mechanism, and avoiding settlement discussions in Part 40 itself led the parties to come to grips with the settlement issues rather than postpone them to the appearance in Part 40.

The second phase of the Comprehensive Civil Justice Program, first initiated in 1999, was launched by the Unified Court System in 2005. The Program introduced differentiated case management to the state court system and took other steps designed to improve efficiency and productivity. The second phase of the effort began with a report issued in 2005 by then-First Deputy Chief Administrative Judge Ann Pfau. Among other things, the report suggested that a center for complex litigation should be created. Judge Silbermann was required to address the issues raised in the report and to take various steps to respond to the report's concerns and its emphasis upon increased productivity and attention to court system standards and goals.

Judge Silbermann created the Center for Complex Litigation in the court, which has continued to function until today. There, complex litigation not assigned to the Commercial Division, such as mass tort litigation, is addressed by Justices specifically assigned to these inventories. She assigned Justices who served in the Center.

The Center for Complex Litigation was and is also related to the Litigation Coordinating Panel created under Uniform Rule 202.69, which is the New York State analogue of the Federal Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. This rule went into effect in January 2002. The Clerk's Office of the Coordinating Panel operates out of this court and one of the Justices of this court is a member of the Panel. Many of the cases dealt with by the Panel ended up in the Center for Complex Litigation. For example, in 2006 alone, Justice Silbermann designated the Justices who were assigned to handle the Bextra, Celebrex, and Vioxx litigations, the Fleet Phospho Soda Cases, the Nerontin Cases, and the Hormone Replacement Therapy litigation. Under Judge Silbermann's leadership, the rules and procedures of the Panel were established and a public website for the Coordinating Panel was created by this court (now at www.nycourts.gov/courts/1jd/supctmanh/LCP/LCP-Index.shtml).

During her tenure, Judge Silbermann issued a new edition of the *Operations Manual*, an internal manual that explains court operations for staff.

Judge Silbermann introduced improvements in our motion operations, including a system for adjournment of motions by e-mail. She experimented with a system of conferencing by telephone.

During this period, the court continuously updated and improved its website (which is accessible at www.nycourts.gov/supctmanh). It became a major resource for attorneys and others interested

in knowing how the court functions, who its Judges are and where they are assigned, and other important matters.

In December 2001, a report was issued by the Unified Court System Commission on Fiduciary Appointments appointed by Chief Judge Kaye. This report made many recommendations for the improvement of procedures governing the appointment of guardians in MHL Article 81 cases and other fiduciaries, such as restrictions on the number of appointments a given person could receive. Judge Silbermann was very interested in seeing improvements made to the rules governing these matters and she met with the Commission to discuss the issues before it issued its report. The Commission issued a second report on these appointments in February 2005.

Changes were made to the relevant fiduciary rules in 2002, effective June 2003. Judge Silbermann spent much time and energy in the years that followed addressing the problems in these cases and the reforms made. A major priority was, of course, effective implementation of the reformed rules, which were controversial in some quarters at the outset. She also concerned herself with improving the processing of these cases in this court and reducing delays. She established a Guardianship Committee and sought advice and input from that group as to how to improve the processing of this inventory. Changes were made in judicial assignments in this area. Judge Silbermann immersed herself in the intricacies of this inventory and took a number of steps to improve their processing. For example, she and the Presiding Justice of the Appellate Division, First Department issued a joint Administrative Order in 2005 that established a Compliance Part in this court for guardianship matters in order to monitor compliance with statutory requirements in these cases and a Compliance Calendar for cases in which timely compliance had not occurred or may not have occurred. In 2008, Judge Silbermann issued an Administrative Order directing that all annual reports in guardianship cases should be judicially settled by the assigned Court Examiner.

Under her direction, the court collaborated with the New York County Lawyers' Association to provide assistance in Article 81 matters to lay guardians (generally family members of incapacitated persons), who are often bewildered and overwhelmed by their role and their duties, as well as the emotional impact of their situation.

In 2005, the very able Scott M. Singer was made Court Clerk Specialist in charge of the Guardianship and Fiduciary Support Office and he has presided over many improvements to the operations of that office and the processing of these matters, which continue to this day.

Under Judge Silbermann's leadership, the court developed various forms for use in guardianship cases, such as an Order and Judgment Appointing Guardian, a 90-Day Report, and an Annual Report of the Guardian. These forms were aimed at simplifying the processing of these cases, making things easier for the guardian, and expediting proceedings. The form of Order and Judgment is a

comprehensive document that can be signed quickly, thereby achieving compliance with the short statutory deadlines and avoiding the need for an order to be submitted or settled. The forms and much other information about guardianship proceedings were posted on the court's website, where they continue to be accessible. The form of Order and Judgment was amended most recently in February 2017. This is but one illustration of the facts that Judge Silbermann's work as Administrative Judge has shaped the operations of the court and continues to do so today.

During her tenure, Judge Silbermann explored whether summary jury trials might assist parties and the court as well. Eventually, procedures were developed for such a program. She also initiated a mediation pilot project for matrimonial cases.

Judge Silbermann devoted time to trying to improve the processing of tax certiorari cases, which for many years were the single largest element of the court's inventory. In 2004, for example, over 17,000 such cases were pending here. New cases of this type are commenced in very large numbers each fall. The litigation dynamics of these cases were unique. Only an infinitesimal number of such cases were ever tried. The cases were almost all settled eventually, although settlement of the liability for a particular year might not occur until years later. Settlement discussions typically covered multiple years.

Judge Silbermann reviewed the processing of these cases with court staff and with the Justices assigned to the inventory. She then contacted representatives of the Tax Commission, the New York City Law Department, and the Bar, which is a specialized one, to discuss the litigation. She established a committee composed of representatives of the Commission, the City, and the Bar, together with court staff and County Clerk staff, to review all procedures and consider ways in which the inventory might be more effectively processed. She concluded that attorneys were filing Requests for Judicial Intervention pursuant to stipulations that extended the time to file a note of issue in order to avoid abandonment although judicial intervention was not actually required. After consultation with all interested parties, she issued an Administrative Order that did away with the artificial requirement to file an RJI. At the same time, she sought to provide to the City and the Bar assistance in their settlement efforts, thus endeavoring to meet the needs of the parties while avoiding a situation in which RJIs were filed for no reason related to the merits of any particular case.

Judge Silbermann's reform efforts bore fruit. In time there was a notable decrease in the number of such matters pending. By 2007, for example, the number of such cases pending in the court had declined to around 11,400 and the filings continued to decrease in later years.

As this instance illustrates, an important part of the Judge's approach to administration was to promote communication that could assist the court to achieve its mission. She believed strongly in the usefulness of communication between the court and the Bar, even if budgetary or other con-

straints sometimes prevented the court from accommodating requests from Bar groups. She continued Judge Crane's practice of meeting regularly with the Bar through the vehicles of Advisory Committees, such as the Tort Advisory Committee and the Commercial Division Advisory Committee. The work of the Advisory Committees has had a concrete, positive impact on the operations of the court over the years. She conducted a series of Bench-Bar Fora, which were presentations on topics of interest to the Bar conducted at the courthouse. Panels were put together and CLE credit was made available to those who attended. For example, she and her Commercial Division Advisory Committee presented such a Forum on the Commercial Division rules in 2007 and another on pre-trial practice in the Commercial Division in 2008.

In collaboration with then-County Clerk Norman Goodman, Justice Silbermann led our court's public access project, one of two in the state that over a period of years placed online an unprecedented volume of case and County Clerk information integrated with scanned images of key case documents, through our Supreme Court Records On-Line Library (*Scroll*), developed at 60 Centre St. by her staff. The *Scroll* application was and still is accessible on the public website of our court at no charge to the Bar.

Our public access project was a part of the response of the Unified Court System to the recommendations to the Chief Judge's Commission on Public Access to Court Records (Floyd Abrams, Esq., Chair), which were issued in February 2004. The court's work on this project occurred at a time when the e-filing program remained relatively small and was a harbinger of the direction in which the state's courts would move in the years to follow.

Justice Silbermann held meetings with the staff of the court on a regular basis to explain developments in court administration and to provide an opportunity to entertain and discuss with the staff matters of concern to them.

Judge Silbermann introduced a formal process of orientation for judges and court attorneys new to the court. The revised *Handbook on Case Management and Operations Manual* played roles in this process. Before that time, orientation was ad hoc and informal. This initiative on her part continues today and has grown more comprehensive over the years.

Building upon early efforts of Administrative Judge Riccobono and then-Chief Clerk Jonathan Lippman, Judge Silbermann attempted to promote uniform court rules at Supreme Court, Civil Branch, New York County out of concern that attorneys practicing in this court might encounter burdens from the effort to keep track of many different rules (Part rules). She established a committee chaired by Justice Walter B. Tolub that sought to address this problem. She herself was a member of this committee. The committee promulgated uniform rules for the court outside the Commercial Division, and these have been in effect for a decade or more. Despite her energetic efforts in

this area, however, she was at her retirement dissatisfied with the outcome; the rules of the court, though making up a single document, remained, she felt, unnecessarily complex and divergent from Part to Part.

Justice Silbermann continued the court's efforts to address the needs of the public, including through our Matrimonial Support Office, which for years has handled far more uncontested matrimonial cases than any other court in the state, disposing, for example, of 13,406 such applications in 2006, and our Help Center, the first such office in a court of superior jurisdiction in the state.

For much of her judicial career and throughout her term as Administrative Judge, Judge Silbermann presided over matrimonial Parts. Thus, during her time as Administrative Judge, she had three jobs - - one as Administrative Judge, one as Statewide Administrative Judge, and one as a Justice in a matrimonial Part. She was a skilled and dedicated jurist, diligent in her handling of cases, efficient in the management of her inventory, thoughtful, scholarly and fair. She created a body of important precedent in the matrimonial field, including in regard to the development of the law of equitable distribution and the evolution of the legal concepts of family and custody, and she was renowned for her expertise in this field. However hard-fought the litigation that came before her, even in bitterly-contested matrimonial matters, she entertained the arguments of the parties with an open mind and without bias. Her sense of fairness and the soundness of her judgment were evident in many sensitive cases that came before her, such as a challenge to Governor George Pataki's policy of incarcerating sex offenders after the conclusion of their sentences or an application to bar the City Council from voting on a measure to extend term limits for City officials.

During her time as Statewide Administrative Judge for Matrimonial Matters, Judge Silbermann made training one of her priorities. She developed and led statewide seminars for judges, court attorneys and court clerks on matrimonial law and practice. Materials were developed under her leadership for each of these sessions. Among these materials was a primer on matrimonial practice, which was updated regularly as needed. These internal seminars had an important impact on the administration of the matrimonial Parts statewide. They contributed not just to better management of these Parts and administration of them, but also promoted common "best practices."

Judge Silbermann also instituted training sessions for judges who were newly appointed to matrimonial Parts.

Justice Silbermann promoted compliance with the then-new matrimonial rules set forth in Uniform Rule 202.16, which presented a number of administrative challenges. She worked closely with administrative judges statewide to advance the assignment of highly-qualified and skilled Justices to the matrimonial Parts, which are assignments that carry special burdens.

One of Judge Silbermann's early initiatives as Statewide Administrative Judge was the development of an Uncontested Divorce Packet. The Judge recalled her experience as a practitioner and the difficulties she and her fellow attorneys had faced when filing for uncontested divorces. The forms and procedures used in the processing of these matters varied widely among the counties of the state. It was thus very burdensome and frustrating for practitioners to sort out and keep track of these variations, which made the processing of these matters more time-consuming and expensive than necessary. Accordingly, she proposed that a uniform package of materials be developed. It was also important to her that these materials would be made as clear and as simple as possible since they would be used by persons who had no attorney representing them.

The proposed materials went through a number of versions. In the end, an Uncontested Divorce Packet was promulgated composed of standardized necessary forms in simplified format. The progress thus made has continued over the years since. Today, standard forms are made available on the court system's website.

Judge Silbermann appointed a Committee on Matrimonial Practice, which she chaired. This committee, on which leading matrimonial judges and practitioners served, provided advice and suggestions to her on many leading subjects in the field. The Committee proposed legislation, commented on pending proposals, developed ideas for rules and forms, and advanced communications with Bar groups.

Judge Silbermann possessed and exhibited the utmost respect for our appellate courts, and was delighted whenever a colleague ascended to that lofty realm. Her true loves, however, were our courts of original jurisdiction and all of the habitues thereof: trial judges, trial attorneys, court clerks, court reporters, court officers, court attorneys, County Clerk staff, and all parties in need of the court's attention.

When she first became Administrative Judge at 60 Centre St., she indicated that she would have an open-door policy and that she did throughout her tenure. Despite the whirlwind of activity in which she was engaged for 20 years, which included not just fully-packed work days but many Bar group meetings and other gatherings after hours and on weekends, she always made time for judges, staff attorneys, clerks, court officers, county clerk staff and everyone else. She understood the pressures on Judges and sought to serve as a counselor, helper, and friend to them, while also explaining the concerns and needs of the Judges and their perspectives to the Central Administration.

Notwithstanding her crushing workload and heavy responsibilities, she was known throughout the courthouse for the warmth, kindness, good humor, and sincere interest with which she treated every person on staff. There has surely never been a more down-to-earth Administrative Judge nor one more sincerely concerned with the well-being of her staff.



Judge Silberman with her daughter, Jane Bennett

As an administrator, she did not over-manage operations personally nor did she dictate policy without hearing the thoughts of the Judges and her administrative staff. She viewed her colleagues and her staff as resources whose ideas could help her improve the court. She demonstrated beyond dispute that a chief can follow a cooperative, team approach and achieve a vast amount of good for the public whom we serve.

John F. Werner, Esq., Chief Clerk and Executive Officer, and Robert C. Meade, Jr., Esq., then Special Counsel to the Administrative Judge, worked with Judge Silberman every day for almost eight years. They wrote of her on her retirement:

“We have seen up close the skill with which she has handled challenges that have often been far more complex, sensitive and seemingly intractable than may [have been] appreciated. Administration in a large and complicated organization like the Unified Court System can be a difficult, thankless and frustrating undertaking, but we have seen the equanimity and good humor with which she has approached difficulties and disappointments. Court administration is not a job for the faint of heart or the pessimistic and she is neither.

“....She has earned a place in all of our hearts. She leaves with the gratitude, respect, and affection of everyone who works in New York County Supreme Court, in the matrimonial parts, and in our wider court system, who will always think of her as she has been every day during all of these years—a model of all that a judge should be.” *

Judge Silberman has been very active in Bar association affairs. She serves on the boards of Fordham University School of Law and the New York State Association of Woman Judges, and she served as the President of the New York Women's Bar Association. She also has been active in Judges and Lawyers Breast Cancer Alert; the American Bar Association and the New York State Bar Association; the Family Law and Judicial Sections of the New York State Bar Association; the Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers; the New York Association of Collaborative Professionals; and the Interdisciplinary Forum.

Justice Silberman continues to pursue justice, now as Of Counsel at the New York City law firm of Dobrish Michaels Gross LLP, a family and matrimonial law firm.

February 2019

SOME SOURCES

Hon. Jacqueline W. Silberman, Child Custody in Contested Matrimonials, 80 NYSBAJ 16 (Jan. 2008).

Hon. Jacqueline W. Silberman, Electronic Filing: A Progress Report, *New York Law Journal*, p. 2 (Nov. 9, 2005).

Hon. Jacqueline W. Silberman, New York County Filing Project for Tax Certiorari Cases Records 30-Fold Rise in Electronic Filings, 76 NYSBAJ 30 (Feb. 2004).

Hon. Jacqueline W. Silberman, Electronic Filing in New York - - A Progress Report, 4 E-Filing Report 9 (Glasser LegalWorks Dec./Jan. 2003/2004).

Hon. Jacqueline W. Silberman, Moderator, The Role of Advocates, Guardians and Forensic Experts in Custody and Visitation Cases, Conference, Women, Children and Domestic Violence: Current Tensions and Emerging Issues, 27 Fordham Urb. LJ 567, 773 (2000).

John F. Werner & Robert C. Meade, Jr., *Tribute to Justice Silberman*, N.Y. Law Journal, Dec. 26, 2008.

FOOTNOTE

* Werner & Meade, *supra*.