

ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT RULES COMMITTEE  
PUBLIC HEARING

PROPOSALS: 24-15  
24-16  
24-17  
24-18  
25-01  
25-02  
25-03  
25-04

Report of proceedings had at the hearing in the  
above-entitled cause before the Supreme Court Rules  
Committee, commencing at 10:00 a.m., on the 23rd day of  
April, 2025.

APPEARANCES:

JAMES A. HANSEN - CHAIR  
ANDRE GRANT  
RICHAR HARDEN  
JENNIFER B. JOHNSON  
DAVID R. NAVARRO  
DANIEL M. KOFIN  
TRACIE PORTER  
MIRANDA L. SOUCIE  
JOHN SPESIA  
MARY K. O'BRIEN  
KETH H. BEYLER  
MARTIN DOLAN

1 CHAIR HANSEN: Welcome everybody to the Illinois  
2 Supreme Court Rules Committee public hearing. Today is  
3 Wednesday, April 23, 2025. Welcome to all the  
4 Committee members and Justice O'Brien, thank you. Our  
5 new Committee members Justice Porter and Mr. Kotin.

6 The hearing today will get started. I will  
7 let the speakers who are on the list know that we are  
8 on a schedule. You each will have ten minutes. I hate  
9 to be rude, but that's part of the job. And if you  
10 start going over, we'll have to cut you off.

11 The Committee members may have some questions  
12 for you. Please be ready to answer those if we have  
13 any. We have been provided, as you can imagine, all  
14 the written materials. We have been provided the  
15 written comments that were also submitted, so we are  
16 familiar with the item on the agenda.

17 That being said, I will call out the speaker  
18 and the proposal that you are here to speak on, and we  
19 will get started. Before we do, I think today is  
20 Administrative Assistant's Day and -- which is saying  
21 there isn't probably anyone in this room that isn't  
22 here but for the work of a good assistant or two. So  
23 do your best to thank them along the way, and I was  
24 nice enough to say thanks to mine before I left last

1 night. That being said, we will get started.

2 The first proposal on the agenda is 24-15  
3 which is amending Supreme Court Rule 703 on educational  
4 requirements. And our first speaker is Lexie Rice  
5 representing the Board of Admissions. Good Morning.

6 MS. RICE: Good morning. There we go. My name is  
7 Lexie Rice. I'm the staff attorney with the Illinois  
8 Board of Admissions to the Bar. Here with me is Eric  
9 Lohrenz who is the Director of Admissions to Illinois  
10 Board of Admissions to the Bar. So I'm here to speak  
11 about two proposals. The first is 24-15.

12 CHAIR HANSEN: Yes. And I'll just take you're  
13 also speaking on 24-16?

14 MS. RICE: Yes, that's correct.

15 CHAIR HANSEN: That's amending Rule 704 on the  
16 qualification on examination.

17 MS. RICE: That's correct. Yes.

18 So first, 24-15, we are seeking to amend  
19 Supreme Court Rule 703 which pertains to the  
20 educational requirements required to seek admission to  
21 the bar on examination. The memo that we submitted  
22 explains our proposal in greater detail. But briefly  
23 we are -- the Board is seeking to eliminate reference  
24 to the preliminary and college work as that language is

1 redundant with the ABA requirements. And the Board  
2 seeks to define what is meant by "first degree in law"  
3 as a JD or an LLB; a juris doctor or bachelor's of law  
4 and to clarify that an LML or an SJD is not a first  
5 degree in law.

6 This is not a substantive change but rather  
7 meant to pre-empt questions from perspective applicants  
8 regarding what a first degree in law means. Mostly,  
9 this kind of question comes from our foreign license  
10 applicants who may not be familiar with the U.S. legal  
11 educational system. We get this question enough that  
12 we felt it warranted a specific call out in the rule.

13 From my understanding, the only response to  
14 this proposal was from the ISBA who expressed their  
15 support for the proposal. If the Committee has any  
16 questions pertaining to Proposal 24-15 I'd be happy to  
17 address those now.

18 CHAIR HANSEN: I only have one.

19 MS. RICE: Sure.

20 CHAIR HANSEN: Can you get an LLM without a JD?  
21 How is that possible that that could be your first  
22 degree?

23 MS. RICE: Well, if you are licensed and have  
24 gotten your education in a foreign country, you can

1 then come to the U.S. and get an LLM from an ABA  
2 institution.

3 CHAIR HANSEN: Okay. We don't -- Is it currently  
4 that the rule does not count that out of country degree  
5 as a first degree as to (inaudible) --

6 MS. RICE: It's not a -- It wouldn't be from an --  
7 a first degree in law from an ABA accredit institution.

8 CHAIR HANSEN: Okay. All right. Thank you.

9 MS. RICE: Are there any other questions  
10 pertaining to this proposal? Okay.

11 Well, then I will move on to the next which  
12 is Proposal 24-16. The Board is seeking to amend rule  
13 704 which pertains to qualification on examination,  
14 otherwise know as the bar exam. Again, our memorandum  
15 submitted explains in greater detail but briefly the  
16 Board as suggested various changes in light of the  
17 upcoming transition to the Next Gen exam which Illinois  
18 has announced that it plans to administer beginning in  
19 2028. And the deep commission of the uniform bar exam  
20 or otherwise known as the UBE, which Illinois currently  
21 offers to applicants.

22 In light of this upcoming transition, the  
23 Board recommends revising the language of Rule 704(d)  
24 to more broadly describe the bar exam, rather than

1 refer to a specific exam. This change would allow for  
2 the selection of the specific version of the exam and  
3 other details related to the administration of the exam  
4 to be incorporated into the Illinois Board of Admission  
5 to the bar rules of procedure rather than requiring  
6 further -- excuse me -- rather than requiring further  
7 amendments to Rule 704(d) as more details regarding the  
8 Next Gen exam are determined.

9 The remaining proposed amendments are what we  
10 consider clean-up amendments to tighten up the language  
11 in the rule and to eliminate language that is no longer  
12 necessary. Specifically, the Board seeks to define  
13 NCBE as the abbreviation for the National Conference of  
14 Bar Examiners in Rule 704(c) to clarify the  
15 relationship between the Board and the court regarding  
16 the setting of the passing score for the bar exam and  
17 the professional responsibility exam and that's also  
18 set in 704(c), and to eliminate the first clause of  
19 704(d) which references the effective date of the rule.  
20 This language is no longer necessary as the effective  
21 date of adding Rule 704(f) -- or (d) was in 2007 which  
22 was more than four years ago, and thus that  
23 transitional language is no longer necessary.

24 I understand that two responses to this

1 proposal have been submitted. The first from the ISBA  
2 supports the proposal. The second response was  
3 submitted by a former employee of the Board. The  
4 response does not take issue with any of the proposed  
5 changes to Rule 704 but instead suggests an additional  
6 change to Rule 704(f).

7 Rule 704(f) currently states a passing score  
8 on the Illinois bar exam is valid for four years  
9 from the last date of examination. The response  
10 proposes that Rule 704(f) be amended to state an  
11 individual applicant's passing score is valid from the  
12 date of the examination administered to the applicant.

13 The rationale for the suggested change is  
14 that some applicants take the exam over an extended  
15 number of days instead of the traditional two days.  
16 The proposal suggests it would be more equitable to  
17 extend the deadline for expiration of the scores to the  
18 last date the individual applicant took the exam.

19 The Board has considered this proposal but  
20 does not see a reason to change the Board's proposal  
21 for a variety of reasons. First, the response is based  
22 on an incorrect assumption about how the rule works.  
23 Regardless of when an applicant finishes the exam, all  
24 scores are released on the exact same day. Thus,

1 there's no disadvantage to those applicants who test  
2 over four days instead of two.

3 In fact, the response would actually provide  
4 an advantage to those applicants who test over an  
5 extended day rather than leveling the playing field if  
6 their score would then be valid for additional days  
7 over the standard two-day applicant.

8 Second, to implement this change frankly  
9 would be an administrative nightmare. The applicants  
10 would have to identify themselves as someone who is  
11 taken the exam over extended time which applicants  
12 traditionally do not want to do. Then the -- our staff  
13 would have to calculate -- would have to look up their  
14 exam, see when they took it. It would just be a mess  
15 to be honest.

16 Right now, all the applicants who are sitting  
17 for the July 2025 exam, they know that their scores  
18 will expire on the same date, on July 30th, 2029. And,  
19 finally, this version of the rule has been in effect  
20 for a long time, since 2007. It has worked for many  
21 years, and it has never been an issue. There's just no  
22 reason to adopt the change proposed in the response.

23 If the board were to adopt any change,  
24 perhaps it would change the last date of the



1 examination -- that's the language in the rule -- to  
2 state the Wednesday of the examination similar to the  
3 change proposed in Proposal 24-17. But, otherwise,  
4 it's really just not necessary.

5 If there are any questions about this  
6 proposal, I'd be happy it address them now.

7 CHAIR HANSEN: Any Committee members have any  
8 questions?

9 I have one.

10 MS. RICE: Sure. Of course.

11 CHAIR HANSEN: On the -- It's more of a  
12 clarification. So in Section 1 you're deleting the  
13 specific reference to the uniform bar examination based  
14 on a test that is not going to (inaudible) 2028,  
15 correct?

16 MS. RICE: Right. Right. So instead of a  
17 specifically identifying the UBE, we are taking out  
18 that specific identification in anticipation of  
19 adopting the Next Gen exam.

20 CHAIR HANSEN: I just wanted to get out very far  
21 ahead of the Next Gen even though it doesn't go into  
22 place in 2028.

23 MS. RICE: Right. We're just looking forward,  
24 because we're going to be over the course of the next

1 year determining what the cut score will be and  
2 determining when we will, in fact, first administer  
3 that. So because this rule process does take some  
4 time, we wanted to make sure that we are ahead of this  
5 and can get that rule in place before we have to have  
6 the rule in place.

7 CHAIR HANSEN: Thank you.

8 MS. RICE: Sure. Thank you very much for your  
9 time.

10 CHAIR HANSEN: Eric Lohrenz will be talking about  
11 Proposal 24-17 and 24-18. Again, these talk about Rule  
12 704(a) and 706.

13 MR. LOHRENZ: Thank you. Good morning, Justice  
14 O'Brien and members of the rules Committee. I'm Eric  
15 Lohrenz, and I'm the Director of Administration for the  
16 Board of Admissions to the Bar. As you stated I will  
17 be talking about Proposals 24-17 and 24-18.

18 The first proposal, 24-17, proposes  
19 amendments to rule 704(a) which is the rule for  
20 admission by transferred UBE score. The Board of  
21 Admissions is proposing to amend the rule in two main  
22 respects and is also proposing a couple clean-up  
23 amendments.

24 The first main respect in which we want to

1 amend 704(a) is to clarify in paragraph A of the rule  
2 the date on which a score on the UBE is deemed to be  
3 attained, and the date we are proposing for that is the  
4 Wednesday of the week in which the bar exam was  
5 administered.

6 The reason for this change, as Ms. Rice  
7 alluded to, is to provide certainty to all applicants  
8 as to the date on which their score will expire. They  
9 will all know what Wednesday was the last day of their  
10 bar exam. Again, Mr. -- There were comments by  
11 Mr. Schuster with respect to paragraph A of Rule 704(a)  
12 again to extend the period for those who are  
13 nonstandard examinees who might need another day or two  
14 to complete the exam.

15 And for the same reasons that Ms. Rice  
16 explained, there -- the Board does not see any reason  
17 to make that change. We have certainty -- we will have  
18 certainty with the rule that we propose and without  
19 that we would incur the administrative burdens of  
20 individually tracking the length of time a test was  
21 administered to each applicant. Moreover for Rule  
22 704(a), the tests are administered in another  
23 jurisdiction which would add another layer of  
24 administrative burden. And for the same reasons that

1 Ms. Rice explained, really all applicants receive their  
2 score on the same day and -- so it would -- they would  
3 have the same period of time from the date they  
4 received their score until the four years after the  
5 Wednesday of the week in which they took the bar to  
6 submit a request to transfer their score. So that's  
7 the first main proposal.

8 Are there any questions on that aspect of our  
9 proposal regarding Rule 704(a)?

10 CHAIR HANSEN: Judge Porter.

11 JUDGE PORTER: Just one question. Historically,  
12 has it always been on Wednesday or do these rules  
13 provide you flexibility to give those scores beyond  
14 that Wednesday say if there's administrative issue or  
15 otherwise?

16 MR. LOHRENZ: The bar exam is always administered  
17 on the last Tuesday and Wednesday of February or July  
18 if that was your question. In terms of when we give  
19 the scores out, that's not for weeks or months after.  
20 For the February exam, we typically release -- or the  
21 scores are typically released in early April. And for  
22 the July bar exam, they're typically released in  
23 October. But, again, these are different jurisdictions  
24 that we're talking about so their schedule may carry.

1 JUDGE PORTER: I guess more specifically by  
2 putting a specific day of the week, does that give you  
3 flexibility to say do it on Thursday or Friday? Do the  
4 rules speak to giving you some discretion of  
5 flexibility if we put a hard and fast day of the week  
6 in the rule?

7 MR. LOHRENZ: In terms of flexibility, the court  
8 has the inherent authority to address special  
9 circumstances by way of petition. And what would  
10 happen is, somebody who felt that they needed an  
11 additional period of time would submit a petition to  
12 the board, grant -- requesting that relief. I'm  
13 sorry -- we would submit a petition to the court, and  
14 those petitions then are sent over to the Board. The  
15 Board considers them and makes a recommendation to the  
16 court.

17 CHAIR HANSEN: Justice Navarro.

18 JUSTICE NAVARRO: So I guess the question then --  
19 or the reason that we don't go with the date the scores  
20 are released is because you said that day changes by  
21 jurs- -- or varies by jurisdiction?

22 MR. LOHRENZ: Yes. And that would create another  
23 administrative burden in track -- and even Illinois  
24 depending on the days of the week that, you know, 1st

1 of April is -- as target date. But it may fall on a  
2 Saturday or Sunday, and so we -- the easy date is just  
3 to pick a date that everybody knows and that will be  
4 the Wednesday of the bar exam week.

5 JUSTICE NAVARRO: Which is always like you said  
6 the last Tuesday and Wednesday --

7 MR. LOHRENZ: Exactly.

8 JUSTICE NAVARRO: -- (inaudible) last Tuesday and  
9 Wednesday of February.

10 MR. LOHRENZ: Exactly.

11 All right. If there are no more questions  
12 about that aspect of our proposal, I will turn to the  
13 second main respect in which the Board is asking to  
14 amend rule 704(a), and that would be by expanding Rule  
15 704(a) paragraph B to allow certain graduates of  
16 foreign law schools to transfer their UBE score to  
17 Illinois.

18 At present Illinois allows both graduates of  
19 ABA approved law schools and graduates of foreign law  
20 schools to sit for the bar exam. Foreign law school  
21 graduates have to meet additional requirements  
22 primarily concerning having five -- having practiced  
23 law under one of their -- under a license which could  
24 be a U.S. license or their foreign license for five

1 other preceding seven years.

2           However, on the side of allowing transfer  
3 scores of -- under Rule 704(a), the current rule only  
4 limits that to graduates of ABA approved law schools.  
5 So the reason for this proposed change is to create  
6 symmetry between those who can get admitted to the bar  
7 in Illinois by taking the Illinois version of the UBE  
8 which is the same as everybody, but the Illinois  
9 administration of the UBE or the administration in  
10 other jurisdiction.

11           Does anybody have any questions about that?

12           CHAIR HANSEN: No.

13           MR. LOHRENZ: Okay. And, finally, with respect to  
14 Proposal 24-17, the Board is proposing a couple of  
15 minor clean-up amendments to rule 704(e) and (f). And  
16 the first change again has to do with removing some  
17 transitional language that no longer applies. This is  
18 rule 704(a) paragraph E which required that a person  
19 shall not be eligible for admission prior to  
20 November 7, 2019. We're now well passed that.

21           And then the other clean-up change is to add  
22 a clarification at the end of the whole paragraph F  
23 which is now going to be paragraph E, stating that in  
24 addition to the requirements set forth in this rule in

1 paragraph E the applicant must satisfy all of their  
2 applicant -- other requirements of Rule 704(a).

3 So any more questions on Rule 704(a) or this  
4 proposal?

5 CHAIR HANSEN: No. Thank you.

6 MR. LOHRENZ: The Board's fourth and final  
7 proposal is Proposal 24-18, and this proposes rule  
8 amendments to Illinois Supreme Court Rules 706 and 716.  
9 And Proposal 24-18 proposes to amend the Rule 706 in  
10 forming respects, one of which concerns the free  
11 structure for applications under Rule 716 related to  
12 limited admission of house counsel. And for the change  
13 in fee structure under Rule 716, the Board is also  
14 proposing complementary changes to Rule 716 itself.

15 The first main aspect in which the Board  
16 proposes to amend Rule 706 is to adjust the fees for  
17 first time and repeat applicants to sit for the  
18 Illinois Bar examination. That includes two fee  
19 components. One being the examination fee and the  
20 other being the character and fitness registration fee.

21 The application fee -- I'm sorry -- the  
22 character and fitness registration fee generally is  
23 only paid one time. And even if an applicant fails the  
24 bar, they would not have to pay the registration fee



1 again. Rather they would just have to pay a  
2 re-examination fee.

3 The key points about this proposal to  
4 increase these fees is that the fees have not been  
5 changed for -- have not been increased since the 2014  
6 for the bar exam fees, and since at least 2004 for the  
7 character and fitness registration fee. And the fee  
8 increases that we are proposing are less than the  
9 consumer price index over that same period of time.

10 In support of the proposed increases, the  
11 Board notes that their costs have increased for all  
12 aspects of the administering admissions rules in the  
13 intervening years since the fees were last increased.  
14 And the cost of the increased include overhead  
15 supplies, equipment, employee cost, and investigation  
16 cost. The Board therefore feels it is necessary to  
17 propose these changes and fees pursuant to Rule 706.

18 CHAIR HANSEN: So if you fail the bar, will you  
19 have to then pay the character and fitness fee again as  
20 well or is it --

21 MR. LOHRENZ: No, just -- just the re-examination  
22 fee. The character and fitness process, the way the  
23 character and fitness process works is that if an  
24 applicant fails the bar, we will put processing of

1 their character and fitness application on hold. But  
2 once they file -- once they submit an application to  
3 take the next bar exam or a subsequent bar exam, the  
4 processing of the character and fitness application  
5 will resume with no additional charges to the  
6 applicant.

7 The second main respect in which the Board  
8 proposes to amend Rule 706 is to amend Rule 706(e) to  
9 create a bifurcated fee structure for admission on  
10 motion Rule 705. And currently the fee for a Rule 705  
11 application for admission on motion is \$1,500. That is  
12 paid all at once but only after an applicant has  
13 submitted a preliminary questionnaire which basically  
14 is an offer of proof that they can meet the  
15 experiential educational requirements for admission on  
16 motion of which the character and fitness requirements  
17 are handled in the ordinary course.

18 What happens -- what we find is that Board  
19 staff spend a significant amount of time reviewing  
20 these preliminary questionnaires. And even if an  
21 applicant submits a questionnaire that shows that they  
22 clearly aren't going to pass, we sometimes will -- or  
23 I'm sorry -- clearly aren't going to qualify for the  
24 admission on motion, we may offer them some

1 suggestions. Like, you just took the bar exam in New  
2 York two years ago, and it looks like your score is  
3 high enough. Perhaps you should consider applying  
4 under Rule 704(a) or it looks like you're just coming  
5 into Illinois to work for a corporation. Have you  
6 considered applying under Rule 716?

7 So we do spend some time reviewing these  
8 preliminary questionnaires, and the applicants get some  
9 benefit from it. But what happens is, we don't get any  
10 fees to offset those administrative expenditures of  
11 time and resources until they file an actual full  
12 application under Rule 705.

13 So the reason -- so the idea behind the  
14 bifurcated fee structure is to allow the Board to  
15 re-coop some of its administrative costs and without  
16 increasing the overall cost to the applicant.

17 CHAIR HANSEN: We have one question that was on  
18 the prior amendment.

19 MS. SOUCIE: Thank you. Miranda Soucie. Thank  
20 you again for your explanations on the fees. I  
21 understand that the increased enhanced fees are below  
22 the consumer price index.

23 MR. LOHRENTZ: Yes.

24 MS. SOUCIE: But with respect to sort of your

1 analysis -- the Board's analysis, have you looked at  
2 what the anticipated budgetary constraints will be over  
3 maybe the next three to five years to see if this will  
4 account for what we anticipate the increased budget  
5 will be in that time frame?

6 MR. LOHRENTZ: Yes. We have looked at the next  
7 three to five years. I will say that we have not  
8 factored in any additional costs for Next Gen. The  
9 Next Gen bar exam which will become the Illinois Bar  
10 Exam in 2028.

11 Currently, the National Conference of Bar  
12 Examiners has told us that they're current pricing  
13 structure for Next Gen will remain in place through at  
14 least 2028. And even if we -- we feel that we can,  
15 with the Board's reserves, we can handle the increased  
16 cost of Next Gen through at least 2029 but beyond that  
17 we may have to -- we may have to come back for a  
18 further fee increase which would be driven by the Next  
19 Gen costs.

20 And I would add that one aspect of Next Gen  
21 is that it is an entirely online examination, and  
22 presently we do not provide wi-fi capabilities for  
23 applicants for examinees at our test sites. We will  
24 have to do that going forward.

1 NCBE and its vendor are offering assistance  
2 and counseling advises as to how to meet those  
3 requirements, but until we -- until we get a little bit  
4 closer and until -- I'm sorry. NCBE, I should say, is  
5 still doing some beta testing to refine what those  
6 wire -- what the wireless internet requirements will be  
7 for uploading and downloading the exam.

8 So as soon as that information becomes  
9 available we will start to work with our exam sites to  
10 see what the needs will be to administer an online exam  
11 in those settings and that would -- once we have that  
12 information, we will factor it into our budget.

13 CHAIR HANSEN: Thank you. Anything else in  
14 closing?

15 MR. LOHRENZ: No -- Well, I guess, I will respond  
16 to Mr. Schuster's comments quickly. He has propos --  
17 he suggests that perhaps the proposed amendment to  
18 bifurcated the fee structure for Rule 705 should wait  
19 until the Board moves forward with an amendment of Rule  
20 705 itself. And the Board has considered that  
21 suggestion but the changes we are proposing right now  
22 are -- do not substantively change the requirements for  
23 Rule 705. They are demonstrative changes that we feel  
24 are -- can be addressed through the changed Rule 706.

1 CHAIR HANSEN: Thank you. Appreciate it.

2 Next is Justice Rochford to discuss proposals  
3 25-01 and 25-02.

4 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: Good morning. Mary K.  
5 Rochford, I'm a member of the Appellate Administrative  
6 Committee. I'm here on behalf of the Committee, its  
7 members, and it's chairs, Justice Ritina(phonetic)  
8 Lampkin. I am here to speak about 25-01 and 25-02.  
9 These proposals were approved by the Appellate  
10 Administrative Committee without dissent. Our  
11 Committee has representatives from each of the  
12 districts.

13 The rules community has received  
14 communications from Justice Doridy(phonetic) who is a  
15 member of the Appellated Committee. He gave you those  
16 comments in his personal capacity, but I am in full  
17 agreement with his comments as is the Committee.

18 If you don't mind, I think I will start with  
19 25-02. It has been supported by the ISBA, the  
20 Appellate Lawyer's Association, the Public Defender's  
21 Office, and the Office of the State Appellate Defender.  
22 This amendment seeks to make a change to Rule 23 which  
23 wo- -- to delete the requirement that a copy of Rule 23  
24 did -- does -- would no longer be needed to be given.

1 We think that the Rule 23s are now universally  
2 available on our court website. The website makes it  
3 fairly easy to find those Rule 23s, and they're also  
4 available on public research sites. So that is our  
5 proposed change. If there are any questions I'll be  
6 glad to ...

7 CHAIR HANSEN: No.

8 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: Okay. So then I would like to  
9 go on to Proposal 25-01. 25-01 suggests adding a  
10 Section 13-8 -- or section -- I'm sorry -- a subsection  
11 A to rule 13 and also proposes corresponding comments.  
12 This proposal also makes proposed changes to Rule  
13 606(a) and its Rule 606(d). The changes to -- we are  
14 proposing to Rule 13 go hand-in-hand with the changes  
15 to Rule 606(a).

16 Now, this proposal has been supported by the  
17 IS -- Public Defenders. The ISBA raised an issue as to  
18 some clarity needed to Rule 13. The Appellate Lawyers  
19 Association has suggested a change to -- to our  
20 proposed change to Rule 13 which may correct the  
21 ambiguity that the ISBA raised, and it also has  
22 suggested that changes be made to Rule 605(a)(1) and  
23 the admonishments that would be needed to be given by  
24 the Circuit Court.

1           The Committee has not addressed these  
2       proposed changes by the Appellate Lawyers Association.  
3       But I'm speaking on my behalf only, I see merit to the  
4       appellate lawyers suggestions and maybe I will address  
5       them when I talk about what exactly the Committee is  
6       proposing to as to 25-01.

7           We seek to amend Rule 13 to state that the --  
8       an attorney's period of representation continues until  
9       the time for filing of a notice of appeal from the  
10      final judgment. We made this rep- -- proposed change  
11      because we were also suggesting a change to Rule 606(a)  
12      to amend that rule just to provide that a trial court  
13      clerk would need to prepare, sign, and file a notices  
14      of appeal only when the defendant does not have an  
15      attorney and after being advised of his appellate  
16      rights request in open court or later in writing that  
17      they wish to appeal.

18           We felt that this amendment balances the  
19      limitations of the role of the trial court clerk but  
20      also protects an unrepresented defendant's right to  
21      appeal. Because we were making this suggested change,  
22      we also suggested the change to rule 13(g) -- 13(a)  
23      which would state that the period of representation of  
24      an attorney continues until the time for filing notice



1 of appeal from the final judgment.

2 The appellate lawyers has suggested some  
3 changes to that which I don't want to speak on their  
4 behalf but would say that the -- it would continue  
5 until the time for filing the notice of appeal or the  
6 notice of appeal is actually filed. I'm paraphrasing  
7 and I don't mean to step on their toes. But I think  
8 that would eliminate the concern of the ISBA that if a  
9 notice of appeal is filed early in that period of the  
10 30 days in which a notice of appeal is required to be  
11 filed, that they still need to continue their  
12 representation and as the appellate lawyers point out  
13 file a docketing statement.

14 So I think the language that the appellate  
15 lawyers are suggesting would help clarify that concern  
16 of the ISBA. So if -- and we also suggested an  
17 amendment to Rule 606(d) which simplifies the current  
18 language, deletes redundancies, and just clearly states  
19 forth that the notices of appeal must be done in  
20 accordance with the forms in Article 6. So if I have  
21 sufficiently confused you, I'm sorry.

22 CHAIR HANSEN: Yeah, I'll try and un- --

23 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: I tried to go in different  
24 directions between our proposals and the suggestions

1 from --

2 CHAIR HANSEN: Well, I'm going to assume  
3 Mr. Horvath will be addressing 25-02. But one of my  
4 concerns is that issue under the change, the  
5 representation continues through the time for filing  
6 the notice of appeal through final judgment, that  
7 per- -- that window. If I am the attorney and I filed  
8 a notice of appeal, that's my obligation. I'm still  
9 representing the client until that point in time. I  
10 have concern then what happens to me and my obligation  
11 once I've done that.

12 I then need to file my motion to withdraw. I  
13 then need to go through all those steps even though  
14 I've protected the right for the appeal? So I'm  
15 representing the client. I got to do it through the  
16 notice of appeal. To protect my backside, I better  
17 file that notice to make sure I'm not -- just to make  
18 sure everything is okay, but I don't want to keep going  
19 on.

20 I did this to protect the client I was  
21 representing, but we have a clear understanding I'm not  
22 going to do anything going forward. It's now incumbent  
23 on me to do a lot more to get out than it was before I  
24 file that motion of appeal.

1 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: Well, with the Appellate  
2 Lawyer's Association suggested change addresses that  
3 concern of yours.

4 CHAIR HANSEN: Okay. Fair enough. I'll wait for  
5 him to step on up to the podium.

6 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: It clarifies that it would end  
7 either at the end of the period for filing the notice  
8 of appeal or at the time the notice of appeal was  
9 filed.

10 CHAIR HANSEN: Okay. Andre.

11 MR. GRANT: Just following up on what you said.  
12 One of the practices we've been doing at least in the  
13 criminal division is at the time that we filed the  
14 notice of appeal to also file a request for the  
15 appointment of the Appellate Defender's Office, I mean,  
16 just to cover our backside. Because once you file that  
17 notice of appeal you, kind of -- you, kind of, stuck  
18 there for a minute. So how do I get out now? And  
19 then, the way that we've been doing it is to  
20 simultaneously file the notice requesting that the  
21 appellate defender be appointed. I don't know if it's  
22 worked, but we've been doing that.

23 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: Would -- again, I don't --  
24 obviously, I don't think that practice would

1 necessarily need to change under our suggested  
2 amendment but the appellate lawyers maybe again  
3 suggested change would address that as well. You're  
4 doing it simultaneously. Their suggestion is the --  
5 upon the filing of notice of appeal your representation  
6 would end. But the better practice probably would be  
7 to continue what is being done to also seek --

8 MR. GRANT: Just one more question, Justice. Does  
9 the rules state that, that once you file the notice of  
10 appeal your representation ends?

11 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: At our suggested change was  
12 that the representation should continue until the time  
13 for filing of notice of appeal from the filed judgment.  
14 The appellate lawyers are suggesting that because the  
15 notice of appeal is often filed before the end of that  
16 30-day period and that 30-day period also covers the  
17 requirement filing a docketing statement. The better  
18 wording may be that it ends either upon the filing of  
19 the notice of appeal or the expiration of the time.

20 So based on the concern that was raised also  
21 by the ISBA and in my personal capacity, I'm saying  
22 that maybe the appellate lawyers suggested changes may  
23 address the concerns that are raised today and in the  
24 ISBA response.

1 CHAIR HANSEN: Any other questions?

2 Okay. Thank you.

3 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: Thank you for your time.

4 CHAIR HANSEN: We eagerly await Mr. Horvath to  
5 counter that.

6 JUSTICE ROCHFORD: I'm sure he'll be kind as to  
7 the -- thank you.

8 CHAIR HANSEN: Okay. Next we have Judge Ortiz or  
9 designee from the Access to Justice Commission to talk  
10 about proposal 25-04.

11 JUSTICE TAILOR: Good morning. My name is Sanjay  
12 Tailor. I'm here in my capacity as a Commissioner of  
13 the Access to Justice Commission on behalf of Judge  
14 Ortiz, the chair of the commission.

15 Before you this morning is a proposal by the  
16 Access to Justice Commission to amend Supreme Court  
17 Rule 9. This proposal has been vetted by the Supreme  
18 Courts E-business policy board. They've made some  
19 suggestions. We've incorporated those suggestions into  
20 the proposal.

21 The amendments are intended to address issues  
22 that -- to stakeholders are having -- one is  
23 self-represent litigants, SRLs, and those who assist  
24 SRLs. We call them our justice partners, for example,

1 Illinois court help, courts navigator at work. These  
2 recommendations are based on the study that was done in  
3 2022 which we referenced in the letter to Ms. Murphy.

4 The proposal seeks to expand exemptions that  
5 are available to SRLs. And at a very high level, the  
6 revisions to Rule 9, specifically subsection C, go to  
7 the structure, and it's divided into six parts  
8 documents that may not be e-filed. That, for example,  
9 is an original will -- on original will cannot be --  
10 the requirement that an original will be filed -- be  
11 filed cannot be satisfied by e-filing it.

12 And then, there are certain documents that  
13 are automatically exempt from e-filing. For example --  
14 and these are -- none of these are being changed, but  
15 just, for example, documents filed by someone who is  
16 incarcerated in this -- SLR who is incarcerated. The  
17 real substance is in the subsection that addresses  
18 documents that are exempt from e-filing upon good cause  
19 shown by certification. And here we propose to expand  
20 the -- what qualifies as good cause.

21 And this would include, for example, the  
22 documents filed by a self-represent litigant who is not  
23 an attorney. And I'll explain that in a moment. But  
24 an SRL who does not have computer literacy, who lacks

1 the technology -- the technological literacy to use the  
2 e-filing system, doesn't have an e-mail account,  
3 doesn't have credit or debit card or bank account or  
4 simply has tried. And I think we, sort of, have all  
5 been that situation where sometimes it just does not  
6 work for us and, and so there's an exemption for that  
7 as well.

8 I had mentioned the carve-out for attorneys.  
9 What we are told by our friends at the E-business  
10 Policy Advisory Board that many attorneys use this  
11 exception when they shouldn't be using it. Because as  
12 we all know, our rules of professional responsibility  
13 require that we maintain technological proficiency, and  
14 so we've carved out from the exemption licensed  
15 attorneys.

16 That is the -- at a very high level, the  
17 changes that we are proposing to help make it easier  
18 for SRLs to access the justice system. We received  
19 feedback, for example, from SRLs who say that this  
20 process is intentionally hard and you're seeking to  
21 either have me just go away or hire a lawyer. And so  
22 we think that there's a need and a demand amongst the  
23 SRL community, and that's what we're trying to do with  
24 this proposal. I welcome any questions.

1 CHAIR HANSEN: I only have one kind of  
2 administratively, I guess. In reading the rule to  
3 qualify for certain things, you have to file the  
4 certificate of exemption. And if you don't have access  
5 to electronic method how are you filing the certificate  
6 of exemption? Is the SRL bringing that down to the  
7 court house and filing it that way then?

8 JUSTICE TAILOR: I think that's the expectation,  
9 yes.

10 CHAIR HANSEN: Okay. Because, kind of,  
11 self-defeating if they file a certificate of exemption  
12 through an internet means and they don't have access to  
13 the internet. So I assume it would have to be  
14 therefore hand delivered to the court by the self --

15 JUSTICE TAILOR: Or mailed or whatever alternative  
16 means there might be to file besides e-filing.

17 CHAIR HANSEN: The old way prior to e-filing.

18 JUSTICE TAILOR: Good old days.

19 CHAIR HANSEN: Thank you. Okay.

20 Anyone else have any questions? Yes, Judge.

21 JUDGE PORTER: In regard to the justice partners,  
22 particularly Illinois Court Help, I know they do a  
23 great job in helping SRLs in that these amendments will  
24 provide even more focus on getting SRLs to e-file. Has



1 the either the commission or your policy -- E-business  
2 Policy and Advisory Committee considered what the  
3 cut-off is? Because SRLs might need to come in person,  
4 and when they do that they can get more done than  
5 trying to do e-filing and taking up resources. It's  
6 just a thought whether the City, the commission, as  
7 well as the Board considered that.

8 JUSTICE TAILOR: Well, I think the assumption is  
9 that there are many SRLs that have the technology or  
10 technological proficiency and would prefer to e-file so  
11 they don't have to come down to the court and certainly  
12 that's something they're encouraged to do, because you  
13 know, our system is such that we want to encourage  
14 e-filing.

15 But what this proposal really is intended to  
16 address is those SRLs who simply don't have the ability  
17 one for reason or the other to take advantage of the  
18 e-filing system. So I'm not sure I answered your  
19 question, but maybe I misunderstood it.

20 JUDGE PORTER: That gave some clarity. I won't  
21 spend a lot of time on it, but I know there is a lot of  
22 assistance already through Illinois Court Help and  
23 other non-for-profits who help (inaudible) --

24 JUSTICE TAILOR: There are help desks in the

1 courthouse if that's what you're referring and  
2 sometimes there's a benefit to come to court. But, you  
3 know, there's benefits of course in e-filing as well,  
4 so.

5 CHAIR HANSEN: Any other questions?

6 Thank you.

7 JUSTICE TAILOR: Thank you.

8 CHAIR HANSEN: Next up Justice Grant from the  
9 E-Business Policy Board on proposal 25-03.

10 JUSTICE GRANT: Good morning, Chairman Hanson,  
11 members of the Committee, Justice O'Brien. I'm Cindy  
12 Grant. I am the vice chair of the advisory board. I  
13 also serve as a clerk of the Supreme Court.

14 Last year the court approved a proposal  
15 amending Rule 9. And in that proposal it provided that  
16 clerks are to use the electronic filing rejection  
17 standards which is a list of specific reasons for  
18 clerks to use when rejecting an electronic filing. The  
19 intent of the rule was to standardize the clerk's  
20 rejection reasons and to ensure that filers understood  
21 why their filing was being rejected.

22 Since then, the advisory board has learned  
23 that some jurisdiction are adopting rules, adding  
24 reasons that are not currently within the standards.

1 The proposed language before you makes it clear that  
2 the clerks are only to use the language in the -- those  
3 standards. On behalf of Justice Doherty(phonetic), the  
4 chair of the advisory board, and the advisory board  
5 itself, thank you for consideration. And I'm happy to  
6 answer any questions.

7 CHAIR HANSEN: So, I guess, what's the mechanism  
8 of enforcement when various clerks are not following,  
9 you know, what's put out there? Is this trying to ring  
10 that in?

11 JUSTICE GRANT: It is trying to ring that in, as  
12 well as we're trying to occupy that ground of everybody  
13 knows why -- what the -- the universe of rejection  
14 reasons is. The advisory board is currently  
15 considering other proposals dealing with what you're  
16 asking, Chairman, which is what is the mechanism if a  
17 clerk improperly rejects a document not within the  
18 standards, what would be the remedy for the filer.

19 CHAIR HANSEN: The question I had is: What is the  
20 means or methods of, kind of, disseminating here's a  
21 new rule, we want to make sure you all follow it? Do  
22 you all send that out to the clerks? Does somebody  
23 else take it upon themselves to do that? Who does  
24 that?

1 JUSTICE GRANT: AOIC actually when the rule became  
2 effective September 1 we had two trainings with the  
3 clerks as well as with the -- because the standards are  
4 effective for the court's review so even the appellate  
5 court clerks were subject to the training as well.

6 CHAIR HANSEN: Thank you. All right.

7 MR. HARDEN: Good morning. Can you give us any  
8 examples of rules that clerks have put in place that  
9 are outside of the uniform standards?

10 JUSTICE GRANT: Sure. One that we were  
11 particularly concerned about is rejecting based on an  
12 improper signature. The board had previously  
13 considered that when adopting these standards. We did  
14 not include it at that time so we were -- we were  
15 concerned that was the impetus for this clarification.

16 CHAIR HANSEN: Any others?

17 Okay. Thank you very much.

18 JUSTICE GRANT: Thank you.

19 CHAIR HANSEN: Next Mr. Horvath from the Appellate  
20 Lawyer's Association. You will be talking on, I have  
21 listed here, four proposals.

22 MR. HORVATH: That's correct, and thank you so  
23 much.

24 CHAIR HANSEN: Pleasure seeing you again.

1 MR. HARDEN: Chair, pleasure seeing you as well.  
2 Members of the Committee, good morning. The Appellate  
3 Lawyers Association is always very enthusiastic to be  
4 able to weigh in on these proposals so thank you for  
5 indulging us.

6 There is has already been extensive very  
7 detailed discussion about these. I'll try not to  
8 repeat what others have said. I'll try not to repeat  
9 what's in our letter, but I did want to highlight a  
10 couple points that we feel very strongly about and  
11 wanted to emphasize today for the Committee's benefit  
12 and for the Committee's consideration.

13 And I'll cut right to the proposal 25-01,  
14 part of it addresses Rule 13. And Justice Rochford  
15 very capability addressed what that proposal was  
16 intended to accomplish, and we are supportive of that  
17 proposal. But there's a bit of an adjustment to it  
18 that we've submitted to the Committee.

19 I think it's maybe not an overstatement to  
20 say that three words that make any practicing lawyer's  
21 blood pressure go up immediately are "notice of  
22 appeal". Maybe the other three are "statute of  
23 limitations." Notices of appeal are just something  
24 that make practitioners inherently uneasy because there

1 are already so many pitfalls that can be stepped in  
2 with respect to filing those notices. And this rule I  
3 think is intended to create some clarity for  
4 practitioners who are perhaps approaching the end of  
5 their representation of a client.

6 But in our view, the clarity needed to go one  
7 step further, and that's why we proposed some language  
8 that we hope will make it crystal clear that if that  
9 notice gets filed and there's still time within the  
10 30-day deadline for filing the notice, the filing of  
11 the notice terminates the representation or affectively  
12 ends it.

13 And that's why we proposed some language that  
14 clarifies that the representation will proceed as  
15 follows. An attorneys appearance in the trial court  
16 continues until the time for filing an appeal on behalf  
17 of the client has expired or a notice of appeal has  
18 been filed except as to limited scope appearances and  
19 the like.

20 And the particular issue that our membership  
21 was concerned with as appellate lawyers is the issue of  
22 a docketing statement. When one files a docketing  
23 statement in the Appellate Court, it's a representation  
24 to the Appellate Court that there's some level of

1 ongoing involvement with the client.

2 So in our membership's view, it was important  
3 to clarify that once that notice of appeal gets filed  
4 there's no ongoing obligation to file a docketing  
5 statement in the Appellate Court and further prolong a  
6 representation that's intended to end.

7 So we think that the goal of the rule can be  
8 achieved with some further clarity, and that's why we  
9 would submit that proposed clarification to the  
10 Committee for consideration. So that's our position  
11 on -- on the Rule 13 aspect of Proposal 25-01, and I'm  
12 happy to pause for moment and answer any questions  
13 anyone may have.

14 MR. HARDEN: I do.

15 CHAIR HANSEN: Go ahead.

16 MR. HARDEN: Did your group consider including  
17 language that says whichever is first in your  
18 either/or?

19 MR. HORVATH: We -- we didn't actually contemplate  
20 that specific language. But as I look at what we've  
21 proposed, I can see how that may even further clarify  
22 the concept that we're trying to communicate. So I  
23 don't think that we would be opposed to such a  
24 clarification if it makes it even clearer what the

1 delineation at the end of that representation is.

2 JUSTICE GRANT: Does the proposal include language  
3 that termination ends with the filing of the notice of  
4 appeal?

5 MR. HORVATH: I think to answer that question we  
6 intended to address that by including the language "has  
7 expired" or "a notice of appeal has been filed". And  
8 so the concept that we were trying to communicate is  
9 that once that notice get filed that's the end of the  
10 representation. There's no further obligations  
11 following that.

12 I -- perhaps there are other ways to clarify  
13 it. The concern is: We want to make sure it's clear.  
14 And so I don't mean to dismiss or shoot down any  
15 alternative language, we just wanted to make sure that  
16 within the comment period we flag the concept for the  
17 Committee's consideration and gave the Committee some  
18 food for thought.

19 JUSTICE GRANT: Can we make it clearer? I mean,  
20 because the lawyer -- you know, like you pointed out,  
21 once we get into making docketing statements, you put  
22 yourself in the appeal process. Can't we make it  
23 crystal clear that once that notice of appeal is filed  
24 the termination of the representation by the attorney



1 ends. We can -- we don't want it ambiguous. We want  
2 to be out.

3 MR. HORVATH: I think the ALA is always in favor  
4 of further clarity. I think there may be room for even  
5 further clarification here so long as that concept is  
6 communicated. It's -- I think, it's in everyone's  
7 interest, practitioners and the public at large, to  
8 have a very good clarity in a rule like this one.

9 MS. SOUCIE: Andre, I had the exact same thought.

10 So as I was looking at this I'm concerned  
11 about the practitioner who is not a regular appellate  
12 lawyer who would come into this and not understand what  
13 their next obligation is, and I know we talked about  
14 that a little earlier with Justice Rochford. So I  
15 wrote down the filing of a docketing statement with the  
16 Appellate Court indicates an attorney's appearance will  
17 continue in the Appellate Court. Something to that  
18 extent. Just to make it clear that that -- because I  
19 understand what you're saying, but that's not in what  
20 the proposal is or what the alternative language is.

21 MR. HORVATH: I agree with the sentiment in that  
22 it will prompt us to make this comment was the  
23 discussion of a docketing statement. And perhaps we  
24 should make explicit what was implicit in our thoughts

1 in bring the proposal together. So, again, I don't  
2 mean to suggest that we have the panacea for this  
3 entire issue but, you know, the ALA respectfully  
4 submits that some clarification could help here, and we  
5 think it would be a good clarification for all parties  
6 concerned.

7 CHAIR HANSEN: What about instead of using the  
8 word the repre- -- an attorney's appearance in a trial  
9 court continues, it says instead an attorney's  
10 appearance in the trial court ends at the time of  
11 filing the appeal or -- so instead of using the word  
12 "continues" you now have a finality word on the flip  
13 side which is "ends".

14 MR. HORVATH: I suppose, Mr. Chair, the way of  
15 clarifying that would be to say something to the affect  
16 of an attorney's appearance in the trial court ends at  
17 the time the notice of appeal was filed. And it's,  
18 again, perhaps even further clarification of the  
19 concept.

20 CHAIR HANSEN: Yeah. Okay.

21 Anyone else? Yes.

22 JUDGE PORTER: Didn't do appellate work but did  
23 trial work and so if -- if the attorney is in the trial  
24 court they may not continue. What if they find an

1 appellate lawyer to file the notice of appeal, would  
2 they then end their representation by having another  
3 lawyer step up? Has that been addressed in a rule?

4 MR. HORVATH: That's a very interesting and  
5 specific fact pattern. I don't think we were  
6 contemplating that when we looked at the language but  
7 my solution to that issue would be that if trial  
8 counsel retains appellate counsel to file notice that  
9 too should end the representation of trial counsel. I  
10 think that would be a situation where that type of  
11 clarification would make sense.

12 If there are any further questions this, I'm  
13 happy to address them. If not, I just want to make a  
14 couple points on some of the other proposals.

15 CHAIR HANSEN: Go ahead.

16 MR. HORVATH: With regard to the second piece of  
17 proposal 25-01, that's the Rule 606 proposal, that  
18 concerns filing a notice of appeal by the clerk in  
19 criminal cases. It's a specific procedure in criminal  
20 cases. We have as we've indicated in our letter in  
21 favor of that clarification and favor that aspect of  
22 the proposal.

23 We just noted something for the Committee's  
24 consideration with regard to amending the admonishments

1 that are put forward before the criminal court when --  
2 when this situation arises. We didn't propose a formal  
3 change. We just, sort of, alerted the Committee to the  
4 possibility that there may be a need for further  
5 clarification given this is a bit outside the scope of  
6 the proposal regarding Rule 606 and then go to Rule  
7 605.

8 But I wanted to emphasize that for the  
9 Committee's considers. It was something that the ALA  
10 wanted to flag for further discussion. I'm happy to  
11 address any questions on that one as well. I'll pause  
12 for a moment before I proceed.

13 CHAIR HANSEN: Go ahead.

14 MR. HORVATH: And then, with respect to proposal  
15 number 25-02 which is another one that Justice Rochford  
16 very capability addressed, I just wanted to briefly  
17 note and reemphasize that it makes perfect sense to ALA  
18 that you no longer should have to provide a copy of a  
19 Rule 23 order given that in this day and age with  
20 everything be electronically available on the Illinois  
21 Supreme Court's website, it's just an outdated  
22 requirement to the rule. So we're very supportive of  
23 that proposed change in 25-02.

24 I'll also just briefly remark on 25-03. That

1 was the proposal that madam clerk Grant addressed about  
2 the grounds for rejecting e-filings, if I could just  
3 step back for a moment and say it is a great concern of  
4 the ALAs membership to have clarity in the filing  
5 rejection procedures that the Illinois Supreme Court  
6 has on file. It is one of refrains we consistently get  
7 from our members. They want to make sure they know  
8 when a filing is going to be rejected, and I can relate  
9 that to something we've been discussing here this  
10 morning, "notices of appeal."

11 When Appellate lawyers file notices of appeal  
12 I think it's become more customary to file them early  
13 to avoid a situation where something is rejected after  
14 a delay. But it's a topic of intense discussion among  
15 Appellate lawyers and people who practice in the trial  
16 courts across the state as well. So the ALA is very  
17 supportive of clarifying and limiting the bases on  
18 which a clerk's office can enter a rejection notice for  
19 a filing that is made.

20 And I don't want to go beyond my time  
21 allocation. With respect to proposal 25-04, Justice  
22 Tailor very capably described this proposal. The ALA  
23 has submitted a mark-up of the proposal that looked  
24 very extensive -- and I reassure you it is not. The

1     only issue that ALA wants to flag with this proposal  
2     which is the proposal about the procedures for e-filing  
3     exemptions is that there's a well-established rule in  
4     the code of civil procedure where in a probate  
5     proceeding one has to file an original version of the  
6     will with the clerk's office. And there's language in  
7     the comment to proposal 25-04 and that would be in  
8     comment D that suggest -- I don't think intentionally,  
9     but suggests that an exempt SRL, exempt  
10    self-represented litigant, could perhaps file an  
11    electronic version of a will.

12             It's a highly technical issue but we -- we  
13    flagged these changes to suggest that perhaps there  
14    should be clarification to avoid any type of conflict  
15    between the comments in D and the established rule  
16    under the code of civil procedure regarding the filing  
17    of original versions of the will with the clerk's  
18    office.

19             So though there's a fair amount of red ink,  
20    it's all just interlineations and changes that are  
21    intended to address that very nuance point that arises  
22    from the comment. I'm happy to address any questions  
23    about that.

24             CHAIR HANSEN: I had one. Just so what is the

1 change or the recommendation you all offered on the  
2 comment regarding the will? Because I was --

3 MR. HORVATH: The particular change that we're  
4 trying to suggest here is on this comment D, we've  
5 simply added a reference to -- under paragraph D. And  
6 that means that we've distinguished between exceptions  
7 to the requirement and exemptions from the requirement.  
8 And we've suggested phrasing the filing of a will as an  
9 exception to the e-filing requirement rather than as an  
10 exemption. We think that rearrangement of the  
11 categorization may clarify that this is not intended in  
12 any way to conflict with the established practice under  
13 the code of civil procedure for filing original wills  
14 in probate.

15 CHAIR HANSEN: Any other questions?

16 Okay. Thank you very much.

17 MR. HORVATH: Thank you for your time. Have a  
18 good day. Thank you.

19 CHAIR HANSEN: Ladies and gentlemen, that's our  
20 last speaker for the morning on the proposals. We  
21 thank you for your attendance. We will stand in  
22 adjournment for our Committee meeting which will take  
23 place here immediately after. Thank you everyone.  
24 Have a good day.

(Which were all the proceedings had  
in the above-entitled cause.)



STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
 )  
COUNTY OF COOK )

Trixie L Schuzer, being first duly sworn, on oath  
says that she is a Certified Shorthand Reporter doing  
business in the City of Chicago, County of Cook, and  
the State of Illinois.

That she reported in shorthand the proceedings had  
at the foregoing hearing;

And that the foregoing is a true and correct  
transcript of her shorthand notes so taken aforesaid  
and contains all the proceedings had at the said status  
hearing.

*Trixie Schuzer*

TRIXIE L. SCHUZER, CSR

CSR. No. 084-004763

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO  
before me this 2nd day of  
June, 2025.

*Allison L Sedaris*



NOTARY PUBLIC

	15:14	<b>704(f)</b> 6:21 7:6,7,10
<b>\$</b>	<b>24-18</b> 10:11,17 16:7,9	<b>705</b> 18:10 19:12 21:18,20, 23
<b>\$1,500</b> 18:11	<b>25-01</b> 22:3,8 23:9 24:6 37:13 39:11 43:17	<b>706</b> 10:12 16:8,9,16 17:17 18:8 21:24
<b>(</b>	<b>25-02</b> 22:3,8,19 26:3 44:15,23	<b>706(e)</b> 18:8
<b>(d)</b> 6:21	<b>25-03</b> 34:9 44:24	<b>716</b> 16:8,11,13,14 19:6
<b>(f)</b> 15:15	<b>25-04</b> 29:10 45:21 46:7	
<b>1</b>		<b>9</b>
<b>1</b> 9:12 36:2	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b> 29:17 30:6 34:15
<b>13</b> 23:11,14,18,20 24:7 37:14 39:11	<b>30</b> 25:10	<b>A</b>
<b>13(a)</b> 24:22	<b>30-day</b> 28:16 38:10	<b>ABA</b> 4:1 5:1,7 14:19 15:4
<b>13(g)</b> 24:22	<b>30th</b> 8:18	<b>abbreviation</b> 6:13
<b>13-8</b> 23:10	<b>6</b>	<b>ability</b> 33:16
<b>1st</b> 13:24	<b>6</b> 25:20	<b>above-entitled</b> 48:2
<b>2</b>	<b>605</b> 44:7	<b>access</b> 29:9,13,16 31:18 32:4,12
<b>2004</b> 17:6	<b>605(a)(1)</b> 23:22	<b>accomplish</b> 37:16
<b>2007</b> 6:21 8:20	<b>606</b> 43:17 44:6	<b>accordance</b> 25:20
<b>2014</b> 17:5	<b>606(a)</b> 23:13,15 24:11	<b>account</b> 20:4 31:2,3
<b>2019</b> 15:20	<b>606(d)</b> 23:13 25:17	<b>accredit</b> 5:7
<b>2022</b> 30:3	<b>7</b>	<b>achieved</b> 39:8
<b>2025</b> 2:3 8:17	<b>7</b> 15:20	<b>actual</b> 19:11
<b>2028</b> 5:19 9:14,22 20:10, 14	<b>703</b> 3:3,19	<b>add</b> 11:23 15:21 20:20
<b>2029</b> 8:18 20:16	<b>704</b> 3:15 5:13 7:5	<b>added</b> 47:5
<b>23</b> 2:3 22:22,23 44:19	<b>704(a)</b> 10:12,19 11:1,11, 22 12:9 14:14,15 15:3,18 16:2,3 19:4	<b>adding</b> 6:21 23:9 34:23
<b>23s</b> 23:1,3	<b>704(c)</b> 6:14,18	<b>addition</b> 15:24
<b>24-15</b> 3:2,11,18 4:16	<b>704(d)</b> 5:23 6:7,19	<b>additional</b> 7:5 8:6 13:11 14:21 18:5 20:8
<b>24-16</b> 3:13 5:12	<b>704(e)</b> 15:15	<b>address</b> 4:17 9:6 13:8 24:4 28:3,23 29:21 33:16 40:6 43:13 44:11 46:21,22
<b>24-17</b> 9:3 10:11,17,18		

<b>addressed</b> 21:24 24:1 37:15 43:3 44:16 45:1	<b>affectively</b> 38:11	<b>anticipated</b> 20:2
<b>addresses</b> 27:2 30:17 37:14	<b>age</b> 44:19	<b>anticipation</b> 9:18
<b>addressing</b> 26:3	<b>agenda</b> 2:16 3:2	<b>AOIC</b> 36:1
<b>adjournment</b> 47:22	<b>agree</b> 41:21	<b>appeal</b> 24:9,14,17,21 25:1,5,6,9,10,19 26:6,8, 14,16,24 27:8,14,17 28:5, 10,13,15,19 37:22,23 38:16,17 39:3 40:4,7,22, 23 42:11,17 43:1,18 45:10,11
<b>adjust</b> 16:16	<b>agreement</b> 22:17	<b>appearance</b> 38:15 41:16 42:8,10,16
<b>adjustment</b> 37:17	<b>ahead</b> 9:21 10:4 39:15 43:15 44:13	<b>appearances</b> 38:18
<b>administer</b> 5:18 10:2 21:10	<b>ALA</b> 41:3 42:3 44:9,17 45:16,22 46:1	<b>appellate</b> 22:5,9,20,21 23:18 24:2,4,15 25:2,12, 14 27:1,15,21 28:2,14,22 36:4,19 37:2 38:21,23,24 39:5 41:11,16,17 42:22 43:1,8 45:11,15
<b>administered</b> 7:12 11:5, 21,22 12:16	<b>ALAS</b> 45:4	<b>Appellated</b> 22:15
<b>administering</b> 17:12	<b>alerted</b> 44:3	<b>applicant</b> 7:12,18,23 8:7 11:21 16:1,2,23 17:24 18:6,12,21 19:16
<b>administration</b> 6:3 10:15 15:9	<b>allocation</b> 45:21	<b>applicant's</b> 7:11
<b>administrative</b> 2:20 8:9 11:19,24 12:14 13:23 19:10,15 22:5,10	<b>allowing</b> 15:2	<b>applicants</b> 4:7,10 5:21 7:14 8:1,4,9,11,16 11:7 12:1 16:17 19:8 20:23
<b>administratively</b> 32:2	<b>alluded</b> 11:7	<b>application</b> 16:21 18:1,2, 4,11 19:12
<b>admission</b> 3:20 6:4 10:20 15:19 16:12 18:9,11,15,24	<b>alternative</b> 32:15 40:15 41:20	<b>applications</b> 16:11
<b>admissions</b> 3:5,8,9,10 10:16,21 17:12	<b>ambiguity</b> 23:21	<b>applies</b> 15:17
<b>admitted</b> 15:6	<b>ambiguous</b> 41:1	<b>applying</b> 19:3,6
<b>admonishments</b> 23:23 43:24	<b>amend</b> 3:18 5:12 10:21 11:1 14:14 16:9,16 18:8 24:7,12 29:16	<b>appointed</b> 27:21
<b>adopt</b> 8:22,23	<b>amended</b> 7:10	<b>appointment</b> 27:15
<b>adopting</b> 9:19 34:23 36:13	<b>amending</b> 3:3,15 34:15 43:24	<b>approaching</b> 38:4
<b>advantage</b> 8:4 33:17	<b>amendment</b> 19:18 21:17, 19 22:22 24:18 25:17 28:2	<b>approved</b> 14:19 15:4 22:9 34:14
<b>advised</b> 24:15	<b>amendments</b> 6:7,9,10 10:19,23 15:15 16:8 29:21 32:23	
<b>advises</b> 21:2	<b>amount</b> 18:19 46:19	
<b>advisory</b> 31:10 33:2 34:12,22 35:4,14	<b>analysis</b> 20:1	
<b>affect</b> 42:15	<b>Andre</b> 27:10 41:9	
	<b>announced</b> 5:18	
	<b>anticipate</b> 20:4	

**April** 2:3 12:21 14:1

**arises** 44:2 46:21

**Article** 25:20

**aspect** 12:8 14:12 16:15  
20:20 39:11 43:21

**aspects** 17:12

**assist** 29:23

**assistance** 21:1 33:22

**assistant** 2:22

**Assistant's** 2:20

**Association** 22:20 23:19  
24:2 27:2 36:20 37:3

**assume** 26:2 32:13

**assumption** 7:22 33:8

**attained** 11:3

**attendance** 47:21

**attorney** 3:7 24:15,24 26:7  
30:23 40:24 42:23

**attorney's** 24:8 41:16  
42:8,9,16

**attorneys** 31:8,10,15  
38:15

**authority** 13:8

**automatically** 30:13

**avoid** 45:13 46:14

**await** 29:4

---

## B

---

**bachelor's** 4:3

**back** 20:17 45:3

**backside** 26:16 27:16

**balances** 24:18

**bank** 31:3

**bar** 3:8,10,21 5:14,19,24  
6:5,14,16 7:8 9:13 10:16  
11:4,10 12:5,16,22 14:4,  
20 15:6 16:18,24 17:6,18,  
24 18:3 19:1 20:9,11

**based** 7:21 9:13 28:20  
30:2 36:11

**bases** 45:17

**basically** 18:13

**beginning** 5:18

**behalf** 22:6 24:3 25:4  
29:13 35:3 38:16

**benefit** 19:9 34:2 37:11

**benefits** 34:3

**beta** 21:5

**bifurcated** 18:9 19:14  
21:18

**bit** 21:3 37:17 44:5

**blood** 37:21

**board** 3:5,8,10,23 4:1  
5:12,16,23 6:4,12,15 7:3,  
19 8:23 10:16,20 11:16  
13:12,14,15 14:13 15:14  
16:13,15 17:11,16 18:7,18  
19:14 21:19,20 29:18  
31:10 33:7 34:9,12,22  
35:4,14 36:12

**Board's** 7:20 16:6 20:1,15

**briefly** 3:22 5:15 44:16,24

**bring** 42:1

**bringing** 32:6

**broadly** 5:24

**budget** 20:4 21:12

**budgetary** 20:2

**burden** 11:24 13:23

**burdens** 11:19

---

## C

---

**calculate** 8:13

**call** 2:17 4:12 29:24

**capabilities** 20:22

**capability** 37:15 44:16

**capably** 45:22

**capacity** 22:16 28:21  
29:12

**card** 31:3

**carry** 12:24

**carve-out** 31:8

**carved** 31:14

**cases** 43:19,20

**categorization** 47:11

**certainty** 11:7,17,18

**certificate** 32:4,5,11

**certification** 30:19

**chair** 2:1 3:12,15 4:18,20  
5:3,8 9:7,11,20 10:7,10  
12:10 13:17 15:12 16:5  
17:18 19:17 21:13 22:1  
23:7 25:22 26:2 27:4,10  
29:1,4,8,14 32:1,10,17,19  
34:5,8,12 35:4,7,19 36:6,  
16,19,24 37:1 39:15 42:7,  
14,20 43:15 44:13 46:24  
47:15,19

**Chairman** 34:10 35:16

**chairs** 22:7

**change** 4:6 6:1 7:6,13,20  
8:8,22,23,24 9:3 11:6,17  
15:5,16,21 16:12 21:22  
22:22 23:5,19,20 24:10,  
11,21,22 26:4 27:2 28:1,3,

11 44:3,23 47:1,3	<b>closing</b> 21:14	<b>conflict</b> 46:14 47:12
<b>changed</b> 17:5 21:24 30:14	<b>code</b> 46:4,16 47:13	<b>confused</b> 25:21
<b>character</b> 16:20,22 17:7, 19,22,23 18:1,4,16	<b>college</b> 3:24	<b>consideration</b> 35:5 37:12 39:10 40:17 43:24
<b>charges</b> 18:5	<b>comment</b> 40:16 41:22 46:7,8,22 47:2,4	<b>considered</b> 7:19 19:6 21:20 33:2,7 36:13
<b>Cindy</b> 34:11	<b>comments</b> 2:15 11:10 21:16 22:16,17 23:11 46:15	<b>considers</b> 13:15 44:9
<b>Circuit</b> 23:24	<b>commission</b> 5:19 29:9,13, 14,16 33:1,6	<b>consistently</b> 45:6
<b>circumstances</b> 13:9	<b>Commissioner</b> 29:12	<b>constraints</b> 20:2
<b>City</b> 33:6	<b>Committee</b> 2:2,4,5,11 4:15 9:7 10:14 22:6,10,11, 15,17 24:1,5 33:2 34:11 37:2,18 39:10 40:17 44:3 47:22	<b>consumer</b> 17:9 19:22
<b>civil</b> 46:4,16 47:13	<b>Committee's</b> 37:11,12 40:17 43:23 44:9	<b>contemplate</b> 39:19
<b>clarification</b> 9:12 15:22 36:15 39:9,24 41:5 42:4,5, 18 43:11,21 44:5 46:14	<b>communicate</b> 39:22 40:8	<b>contemplating</b> 43:6
<b>clarifies</b> 27:6 38:14	<b>communicated</b> 41:6	<b>continue</b> 25:4,11 28:7,12 41:17 42:24
<b>clarify</b> 4:4 6:14 11:1 25:15 39:3,21 40:12 47:11	<b>communications</b> 22:14	<b>continues</b> 24:8,24 26:5 38:16 42:9,12
<b>clarifying</b> 42:15 45:17	<b>community</b> 22:13 31:23	<b>copy</b> 22:23 44:18
<b>clarity</b> 23:18 33:20 38:3,6 39:8 41:4,8 45:4	<b>complementary</b> 16:14	<b>corporation</b> 19:5
<b>clause</b> 6:18	<b>complete</b> 11:14	<b>correct</b> 3:14,17 9:15 23:20 36:22
<b>clean-up</b> 6:10 10:22 15:15,21	<b>components</b> 16:19	<b>cost</b> 17:14,15,16 19:16 20:16
<b>clear</b> 26:21 35:1 38:8 40:13,23 41:18	<b>computer</b> 30:24	<b>costs</b> 17:11 19:15 20:8,19
<b>clearer</b> 39:24 40:19	<b>concept</b> 39:22 40:8,16 41:5 42:19	<b>counsel</b> 16:12 43:8,9
<b>clerk</b> 24:13,19 34:13 35:17 43:18 45:1	<b>concern</b> 25:8,15 26:10 27:3 28:20 40:13 45:3	<b>counseling</b> 21:2
<b>clerk's</b> 34:19 45:18 46:6, 17	<b>concerned</b> 36:11,15 38:21 41:10 42:6	<b>count</b> 5:4
<b>clerks</b> 34:16,18 35:2,8,22 36:3,5,8	<b>concerns</b> 16:10 26:4 28:23 43:18	<b>counter</b> 29:5
<b>client</b> 26:9,15,20 38:5,17 39:1	<b>Conference</b> 6:13 20:11	<b>country</b> 4:24 5:4
<b>closer</b> 21:4		<b>couple</b> 10:22 15:14 37:10 43:14
		<b>court</b> 2:2 3:3,19 6:15 13:7, 13,16 16:8 23:2,24 24:12, 16,19 29:16 30:1 32:7,14, 22 33:11,22 34:2,13,14 36:5 38:15,23,24 39:5

41:16,17 42:9,10,16,24  
44:1 45:5  
**court's** 36:4 44:21  
**courthouse** 34:1  
**courts** 29:18 30:1 45:16  
**cover** 27:16  
**covers** 28:16  
**create** 13:22 15:5 18:9  
38:3  
**credit** 31:3  
**criminal** 27:13 43:19 44:1  
**crystal** 38:8 40:23  
**current** 15:3 20:12 25:17  
**customary** 45:12  
**cut** 2:10 10:1 37:13  
**cut-off** 33:3

---

**D**

---

**date** 6:19,21 7:9,12,18  
8:18,24 11:2,3,8 12:3  
13:19 14:1,2,3  
**day** 2:20 7:24 8:5 11:9,13  
12:2 13:2,5,20 44:19  
47:18,24  
**days** 7:15 8:2,6 13:24  
25:10 32:18  
**deadline** 7:17 38:10  
**dealing** 35:15  
**debit** 31:3  
**deemed** 11:2  
**deep** 5:19  
**defendant** 24:14  
**defendant's** 24:20

**defender** 22:21 27:21  
**Defender's** 22:20 27:15  
**Defenders** 23:17  
**define** 4:2 6:12  
**degree** 4:2,5,8,22 5:4,5,7  
**delay** 45:14  
**delete** 22:23  
**deletes** 25:18  
**deleting** 9:12  
**delineation** 40:1  
**delivered** 32:14  
**demand** 31:22  
**demonstrative** 21:23  
**depending** 13:24  
**describe** 5:24  
**designee** 29:9

**desks** 33:24  
**detail** 3:22 5:15  
**detailed** 37:7  
**details** 6:3,7  
**determined** 6:8  
**determining** 10:1,2  
**directions** 25:24  
**Director** 3:9 10:15  
**disadvantage** 8:1  
**discretion** 13:4  
**discuss** 22:2  
**discussing** 45:9  
**discussion** 37:7 41:23  
44:10 45:14  
**dismiss** 40:14  
**disseminating** 35:20

**dissent** 22:10  
**distinguished** 47:6  
**districts** 22:12  
**divided** 30:7  
**division** 27:13  
**docketing** 25:13 28:17  
38:22 39:4 40:21 41:15,23  
**doctor** 4:3  
**document** 35:17  
**documents** 30:8,12,15,18,  
22  
**Doherty(phonetic)** 35:3  
**Doridy(phonetic)** 22:14  
**downloading** 21:7  
**driven** 20:18

---

**E**

---

**E-BUSINESS** 29:18 31:9  
33:1 34:9  
**e-file** 32:24 33:10  
**e-filed** 30:8  
**e-filing** 30:11,13,18 31:2  
32:16,17 33:14,18 34:3  
46:2 47:9  
**e-filings** 45:2  
**e-filling** 33:5  
**e-mail** 31:2  
**eagerly** 29:4  
**earlier** 41:14  
**early** 12:21 25:9 45:12  
**easier** 31:17  
**easy** 14:2 23:3  
**education** 4:24



**educational** 3:3,20 4:11  
18:15

**effect** 8:19

**effective** 6:19,20 36:2,4

**either/or** 39:18

**electronic** 32:5 34:16,18  
46:11

**electronically** 44:20

**eligible** 15:19

**eliminate** 3:23 6:11,18  
25:8

**emphasize** 37:11 44:8

**employee** 7:3 17:15

**encourage** 33:13

**encouraged** 33:12

**end** 15:22 27:6,7 28:6,15  
38:4 39:6 40:1,9 43:2,9

**ends** 28:10,18 38:12 40:3  
41:1 42:10,13,16

**enforcement** 35:8

**enhanced** 19:21

**ensure** 34:20

**enter** 45:18

**enthusiastic** 37:3

**entire** 42:3

**equipment** 17:15

**equitable** 7:16

**Eric** 3:8 10:10,14

**established** 46:15 47:12

**everyone's** 41:6

**exact** 7:24 41:9

**exam** 5:14,17,19,24 6:1,2,  
3,8,16,17 7:14,18,23 8:11,  
14,17 9:19 11:4,10,14

12:16,20,22 14:4,20 17:6  
18:3 19:1 20:9,10 21:7,9,  
10

**examination** 3:16,21 5:13  
7:9,12 9:1,2,13 16:18,19  
20:21

**examinees** 11:13 20:23

**Examiners** 6:14 20:12

**examples** 36:8

**exception** 31:11 47:9

**exceptions** 47:6

**excuse** 6:6

**exempt** 30:13,18 46:9

**exemption** 31:6,14 32:4,6,  
11 47:10

**exemptions** 30:4 46:3  
47:7

**expand** 30:4,19

**expanding** 14:14

**expectation** 32:8

**expenditures** 19:10

**experiential** 18:15

**expiration** 7:17 28:19

**expire** 8:18 11:8

**expired** 38:17 40:7

**explain** 30:23

**explained** 11:16 12:1

**explains** 3:22 5:15

**explanations** 19:20

**explicit** 41:24

**expressed** 4:14

**extend** 7:17 11:12

**extended** 7:14 8:5,11

**extensive** 37:6 45:24

**extent** 41:18

## F

**fact** 8:3 10:2 43:5

**factor** 21:12

**factored** 20:8

**fail** 17:18

**fails** 16:23 17:24

**fair** 27:4 46:19

**fairly** 23:3

**fall** 14:1

**familiar** 2:16 4:10

**fast** 13:5

**favor** 41:3 43:21

**February** 12:17,20 14:9

**fee** 16:13,18,19,20,21,22,  
24 17:2,7,19,22 18:9,10  
19:14 20:18 21:18

**feedback** 31:19

**feel** 20:14 21:23 37:10

**feels** 17:16

**fees** 16:16 17:4,6,13,17  
19:10,20,21

**felt** 4:12 13:10 24:18

**field** 8:5

**file** 18:2 19:11 24:13 25:13  
26:12,17,24 27:14,16,20  
28:9 32:3,11,16 39:4 43:1,  
8 45:6,11,12 46:5,10

**filed** 25:6,9,11 26:7 27:9,  
13 28:13,15 30:10,11,15,  
22 38:9,18 39:3 40:7,9,23  
42:17

<b>filer</b> 35:18	<b>Friday</b> 13:3	<b>hand-in-hand</b> 23:14
<b>filers</b> 34:20	<b>friends</b> 31:9	<b>handle</b> 20:15
<b>files</b> 38:22	<b>full</b> 19:11 22:16	<b>handled</b> 18:17
<b>filing</b> 24:9,24 25:5 26:5 27:7 28:5,13,17,18 32:5,7 34:16,18,21 38:2,10,16 40:3 41:15 42:11 43:18 45:4,8,19 46:16 47:8,13	<hr/> <b>G</b> <hr/>	<b>HANSEN</b> 2:1 3:12,15 4:18, 20 5:3,8 9:7,11,20 10:7,10 12:10 13:17 15:12 16:5 17:18 19:17 21:13 22:1 23:7 25:22 26:2 27:4,10 29:1,4,8 32:1,10,17,19 34:5,8 35:7,19 36:6,16,19, 24 39:15 42:7,20 43:15 44:13 46:24 47:15,19
<b>final</b> 16:6 24:10 25:1 26:6	<b>gave</b> 22:15 33:20 40:17	<b>Hanson</b> 34:10
<b>finality</b> 42:12	<b>Gen</b> 5:17 6:8 9:19,21 20:8, 9,13,16,19,20	<b>happen</b> 13:10
<b>finally</b> 8:19 15:13	<b>generally</b> 16:22	<b>happy</b> 4:16 9:6 35:5 39:12 43:13 44:10 46:22
<b>find</b> 18:18 23:3 42:24	<b>gentlemen</b> 47:19	<b>hard</b> 13:5 31:20
<b>finishes</b> 7:23	<b>give</b> 12:13,18 13:2 36:7	<b>HARDEN</b> 36:7 37:1 39:14, 16
<b>fitness</b> 16:20,22 17:7,19, 22,23 18:1,4,16	<b>giving</b> 13:4	<b>hate</b> 2:8
<b>flag</b> 40:16 44:10 46:1	<b>glad</b> 23:6	<b>he'll</b> 29:6
<b>flagged</b> 46:13	<b>goal</b> 39:7	<b>hearing</b> 2:2,6
<b>flexibility</b> 12:13 13:3,5,7	<b>good</b> 2:22 3:5,6 10:13 22:4 29:11 30:18,20 32:18 34:10 36:7 37:2 41:8 42:5 47:18,24	<b>helping</b> 32:23
<b>flip</b> 42:12	<b>graduates</b> 14:15,18,19,21 15:4	<b>high</b> 19:3 30:5 31:16
<b>focus</b> 32:24	<b>grant</b> 13:12 27:11 28:8 34:8,10,12 35:11 36:1,10, 18 40:2,19 45:1	<b>highlight</b> 37:9
<b>follow</b> 35:21	<b>great</b> 32:23 45:3	<b>highly</b> 46:12
<b>food</b> 40:18	<b>greater</b> 3:22 5:15	<b>hire</b> 31:21
<b>foreign</b> 4:9,24 14:16,19, 20,24	<b>ground</b> 35:12	<b>Historically</b> 12:11
<b>formal</b> 44:2	<b>grounds</b> 45:2	<b>hold</b> 18:1
<b>forming</b> 16:10	<b>group</b> 39:16	<b>honest</b> 8:15
<b>forms</b> 25:20	<b>guess</b> 13:1,18 21:15 32:2 35:7	<b>hope</b> 38:8
<b>forward</b> 9:23 20:24 21:19 26:22 44:1	<hr/> <b>H</b> <hr/>	<b>Horvath</b> 26:3 29:4 36:19, 22 39:19 40:5 41:3,21 42:14 43:4,16 44:14 47:3, 17
<b>fourth</b> 16:6	<b>hand</b> 32:14	
<b>frame</b> 20:5		
<b>frankly</b> 8:8		
<b>free</b> 16:10		



<b>house</b> 16:12 32:7	<b>increasing</b> 19:16	
	<b>incumbent</b> 26:22	<b>J</b>
<b>I</b>	<b>incur</b> 11:19	<b>JD</b> 4:3,20
<b>idea</b> 19:13	<b>index</b> 17:9 19:22	<b>job</b> 2:9 32:23
<b>identification</b> 9:18	<b>individual</b> 7:11,18	<b>Judge</b> 12:10,11 13:1 29:8, 13 32:20,21 33:20 42:22
<b>identify</b> 8:10	<b>individually</b> 11:20	<b>judgment</b> 24:10 25:1 26:6 28:13
<b>identifying</b> 9:17	<b>indulging</b> 37:5	<b>July</b> 8:17,18 12:17,22
<b>Illinois</b> 2:1 3:7,9 5:17,20 6:4 7:8 13:23 14:17,18 15:7,8 16:8,18 19:5 20:9 30:1 32:22 33:22 44:20 45:5	<b>information</b> 21:8,12	<b>juris</b> 4:3
<b>imagine</b> 2:13	<b>inherent</b> 13:8	<b>jurisdiction</b> 11:23 13:21 15:10 34:23
<b>immediately</b> 37:21 47:23	<b>inherently</b> 37:24	<b>jurisdictions</b> 12:23
<b>impetus</b> 36:15	<b>ink</b> 46:19	<b>jurs-</b> 13:21
<b>implement</b> 8:8	<b>institution</b> 5:2,7	<b>justice</b> 2:4,5 10:13 13:17, 18 14:5,8 22:2,4,7,14 23:8 25:23 27:1,6,23 28:8,11 29:3,6,9,11,13,16,24 31:18 32:8,15,18,21 33:8, 24 34:7,8,10,11 35:3,11 36:1,10,18 37:14 40:2,19 41:14 44:15 45:21
<b>implicit</b> 41:24	<b>intended</b> 29:21 33:15 37:16 38:3 39:6 40:6 46:21 47:11	
<b>important</b> 39:2	<b>intense</b> 45:14	<b>K</b>
<b>improper</b> 36:12	<b>intent</b> 34:19	<b>key</b> 17:3
<b>improperly</b> 35:17	<b>intentionally</b> 31:20 46:8	<b>kind</b> 4:9 27:17 29:6 32:1, 10 35:20
<b>inaudible</b> 5:5 9:14 14:8 33:23	<b>interest</b> 41:7	<b>Kotin</b> 2:5
<b>incarcerated</b> 30:16	<b>interesting</b> 43:4	
<b>include</b> 17:14 30:21 36:14 40:2	<b>interlineations</b> 46:20	<b>L</b>
<b>includes</b> 16:18	<b>internet</b> 21:6 32:12,13	<b>lacks</b> 30:24
<b>including</b> 39:16 40:6	<b>intervening</b> 17:13	<b>Ladies</b> 47:19
<b>incorporated</b> 6:4 29:19	<b>investigation</b> 17:15	<b>Lampkin</b> 22:8
<b>incorrect</b> 7:22	<b>involvement</b> 39:1	<b>language</b> 3:24 5:23 6:10, 11,20,23 9:1 15:17 25:14,
<b>increase</b> 17:4 20:18	<b>ISBA</b> 4:14 7:1 22:19 23:17,21 25:8,16 28:21,24	
<b>increased</b> 17:5,11,13,14 19:21 20:4,15	<b>issue</b> 7:4 8:21 12:14 23:17 26:4 38:20,21 42:3 43:7 46:1,12	
<b>increases</b> 17:8,10	<b>issues</b> 29:21	
	<b>item</b> 2:16	

18 35:1,2 38:7,13 39:17, 20 40:2,6,15 41:20 43:6 46:6	<b>litigants</b> 29:23	<b>meant</b> 4:2,7
<b>large</b> 41:7	<b>LLB</b> 4:3	<b>mechanism</b> 35:7,16
<b>law</b> 4:2,3,5,8 5:7 14:16,19, 20,23 15:4	<b>LLM</b> 4:20 5:1	<b>meet</b> 14:21 18:14 21:2
<b>lawyer</b> 31:21 40:20 41:12 43:1,3	<b>LML</b> 4:4	<b>meeting</b> 47:22
<b>lawyer's</b> 22:20 27:2 36:20 37:20	<b>Lohrenz</b> 3:9 10:10,13,15 12:16 13:7,22 14:7,10 15:13 16:6 17:21 19:23 20:6 21:15	<b>member</b> 22:5,15
<b>lawyers</b> 23:18 24:2,4 25:2, 12,15 28:2,14,22 37:3 38:21 45:11,15	<b>long</b> 8:20 41:5	<b>members</b> 2:4,5,11 9:7 10:14 22:7 34:11 37:2 45:7
<b>layer</b> 11:23	<b>longer</b> 6:11,20,23 15:17 22:24 44:18	<b>membership</b> 38:20 45:4
<b>learned</b> 34:22	<b>looked</b> 20:1,6 43:6 45:23	<b>membership's</b> 39:2
<b>left</b> 2:24	<b>lot</b> 26:23 33:21	<b>memo</b> 3:21
<b>legal</b> 4:10		<b>memorandum</b> 5:14
<b>length</b> 11:20	<b>M</b>	<b>mentioned</b> 31:8
<b>letter</b> 30:3 37:9 43:20	<b>madam</b> 45:1	<b>merit</b> 24:3
<b>level</b> 30:5 31:16 38:24	<b>made</b> 23:22 24:10 29:18 45:19	<b>mess</b> 8:14
<b>leveling</b> 8:5	<b>mailed</b> 32:15	<b>method</b> 32:5
<b>Lexie</b> 3:4,7	<b>main</b> 10:21,24 12:7 14:13 16:15 18:7	<b>methods</b> 35:20
<b>license</b> 4:9 14:23,24	<b>maintain</b> 31:13	<b>mind</b> 22:18
<b>licensed</b> 4:23 31:14	<b>make</b> 10:4 11:17 22:22 26:17 31:17 35:21 37:20, 24 38:8 40:13,15,19,22 41:18,22,24 43:11,13 45:7	<b>mine</b> 2:24
<b>light</b> 5:16,22	<b>makes</b> 13:15 23:2,12 35:1 39:24 44:17	<b>minor</b> 15:15
<b>limitations</b> 24:19 37:23	<b>making</b> 24:21 40:21	<b>minute</b> 27:18
<b>limited</b> 16:12 38:18	<b>mark-up</b> 45:23	<b>minutes</b> 2:8
<b>limiting</b> 45:17	<b>Mary</b> 22:4	<b>Miranda</b> 19:19
<b>limits</b> 15:4	<b>materials</b> 2:14	<b>misunderstood</b> 33:19
<b>list</b> 2:7 34:17	<b>means</b> 4:8 32:12,16 35:20 47:6	<b>moment</b> 30:23 39:12 44:12 45:3
<b>listed</b> 36:21		<b>months</b> 12:19
<b>literacy</b> 30:24 31:1		<b>morning</b> 3:5,6 10:13 22:4 29:11,15 34:10 36:7 37:2 45:10 47:20
<b>litigant</b> 30:22 46:10		<b>motion</b> 18:10,11,16,24 26:12,24
		<b>move</b> 5:11

**moves** 21:19

**Murphy** 30:3

---

**N**

---

**National** 6:13 20:11

**Navarro** 13:17,18 14:5,8

**navigator** 30:1

**NCBE** 6:13 21:1,4

**necessarily** 28:1

**needed** 13:10 22:24  
23:18,23 38:6

**nice** 2:24

**night** 3:1

**nightmare** 8:9

**non-for-profits** 33:23

**nonstandard** 11:13

**note** 44:17

**noted** 43:23

**notes** 17:11

**notice** 24:9,24 25:5,6,9,10  
26:6,8,16,17 27:7,8,14,17,  
20 28:5,9,13,15,19 37:21  
38:9,10,11,17 39:3 40:3,7,  
9,23 42:17 43:1,8,18  
45:18

**notices** 24:13 25:19 37:23  
38:2 45:10,11

**November** 15:20

**nuance** 46:21

**number** 7:15 44:15

---

**O**

---

**O'BRIEN** 2:4 10:14 34:11

**obligation** 26:8,10 39:4  
41:13

**obligations** 40:10

**occupy** 35:12

**October** 12:23

**offer** 18:14,24

**offered** 47:1

**offering** 21:1

**offers** 5:21

**office** 22:21 27:15 45:18  
46:6,18

**offset** 19:10

**ongoing** 39:1,4

**online** 20:21 21:10

**open** 24:16

**opposed** 39:23

**order** 44:19

**ordinary** 18:17

**original** 30:9,10 46:5,17  
47:13

**Ortiz** 29:8,14

**outdated** 44:21

**overhead** 17:14

**overstatement** 37:19

---

**P**

---

**paid** 16:23 18:12

**panacea** 42:2

**paragraph** 11:1,11 14:15  
15:18,22,23 16:1 47:5

**paraphrasing** 25:6

**part** 2:9 37:14

**parties** 42:5

**partners** 29:24 32:21

**parts** 30:7

**pass** 18:22

**passed** 15:20

**passing** 6:16 7:7,11

**pattern** 43:5

**pause** 39:12 44:11

**pay** 16:24 17:1,19

**people** 45:15

**per-** 26:7

**perfect** 44:17

**period** 11:12 12:3 13:11  
17:9 24:8,23 25:9 27:7  
28:16 40:16

**person** 15:18 33:3

**personal** 22:16 28:21

**perspective** 4:7

**pertaining** 4:16 5:10

**pertains** 3:19 5:13

**petition** 13:9,11,13

**petitions** 13:14

**phrasing** 47:8

**pick** 14:3

**piece** 43:16

**pitfalls** 38:1

**place** 9:22 10:5,6 20:13  
36:8 47:23

**plans** 5:18

**playing** 8:5

**pleasure** 36:24 37:1

**podium** 27:5

**point** 25:12 26:9 46:21  
**pointed** 40:20  
**points** 17:3 37:10 43:14  
**policy** 29:18 31:10 33:1,2 34:9  
**Porter** 2:5 12:10,11 13:1 32:21 33:20 42:22  
**position** 39:10  
**possibility** 44:4  
**practice** 27:24 28:6 45:15 47:12  
**practiced** 14:22  
**practices** 27:12  
**practicing** 37:20  
**practitioner** 41:11  
**practitioners** 37:24 38:4 41:7  
**pre-emp** 4:7  
**preceding** 15:1  
**prefer** 33:10  
**preliminary** 3:24 18:13,20 19:8  
**prepare** 24:13  
**present** 14:18  
**presently** 20:22  
**pressure** 37:21  
**previously** 36:12  
**price** 17:9 19:22  
**pricing** 20:12  
**primarily** 14:22  
**prior** 15:19 19:18 32:17  
**probate** 46:4 47:14  
**procedure** 6:5 43:19 46:4,

16 47:13  
**procedures** 45:5 46:2  
**proceed** 38:14 44:12  
**proceeding** 46:5  
**proceedings** 48:1  
**process** 10:3 17:22,23 31:20 40:22  
**processing** 17:24 18:4  
**professional** 6:17 31:12  
**proficiency** 31:13 33:10  
**prolong** 39:5  
**prompt** 41:22  
**proof** 18:14  
**prop** 21:16  
**proposal** 2:18 3:2,22 4:14, 15,16 5:10,12 7:1,2,16,19, 20 9:3,6 10:11,18 12:7,9 14:12 15:14 16:4,7,9 17:3 23:9,12,16 29:10,15,17,20 30:4 31:24 33:15 34:9,14, 15 37:13,15,17 39:11 40:2 41:20 42:1 43:17,22 44:6, 14 45:1,21,22,23 46:1,2,7  
**proposals** 3:11 10:17 22:2,9 25:24 35:15 36:21 37:4 43:14 47:20  
**propose** 11:18 17:17 30:19 44:2  
**proposed** 6:9 7:4 8:22 9:3 15:5 17:10 21:17 23:5,12, 20 24:2,10 35:1 38:7,13 39:9,21 44:23  
**proposes** 7:10 10:18 16:7, 9,16 18:8 23:11  
**proposing** 10:21,22 11:3 15:14 16:14 17:8 21:21 23:14 24:6 31:17

**protect** 26:16,20  
**protected** 26:14  
**protects** 24:20  
**provide** 8:3 11:7 12:13 20:22 24:12 32:24 44:18  
**provided** 2:13,14 34:15  
**public** 2:2 22:20 23:4,17 41:7  
**pursuant** 17:17  
**put** 13:5 17:24 35:9 36:8 40:21 44:1  
**putting** 13:2

---

## Q

---

**qualification** 3:16 5:13  
**qualifies** 30:20  
**qualify** 18:23 32:3  
**question** 4:9,11 12:11,18 13:18 19:17 28:8 33:19 35:19 40:5  
**questionnaire** 18:13,21  
**questionnaires** 18:20 19:8  
**questions** 2:11 4:7,16 5:9 9:5,8 12:8 14:11 15:11 16:3 23:5 29:1 31:24 32:20 34:5 35:6 39:12 43:12 44:11 46:22 47:15  
**quickly** 21:16

---

## R

---

**raised** 23:17,21 28:20,23  
**rationale** 7:13  
**re-coop** 19:15

<b>re-examination</b> 17:2,21	<b>rejecting</b> 34:18 36:11 45:2 21:3,6,22	
<b>reading</b> 32:2	<b>rejection</b> 34:16,20 35:13 45:5,18	<b>requiring</b> 6:5,6
<b>ready</b> 2:12	<b>rejects</b> 35:17	<b>research</b> 23:4
<b>real</b> 30:17	<b>relate</b> 45:8	<b>reserves</b> 20:15
<b>rearrangement</b> 47:10	<b>related</b> 6:3 16:11	<b>resources</b> 19:11 33:5
<b>reason</b> 7:20 8:22 11:6,16 13:19 15:5 19:13 33:17	<b>relationship</b> 6:15	<b>respect</b> 10:24 11:11 14:13 15:13 18:7 19:24 38:2 44:14 45:21
<b>reasons</b> 7:21 11:15,24 34:17,20,24 35:14	<b>release</b> 12:20	<b>respectfully</b> 42:3
<b>reassure</b> 45:24	<b>released</b> 7:24 12:21,22 13:20	<b>respects</b> 10:22 16:10
<b>receive</b> 12:1	<b>relief</b> 13:12	<b>respond</b> 21:15
<b>received</b> 12:4 22:13 31:18	<b>remain</b> 20:13	<b>response</b> 4:13 7:2,4,9,21 8:3,22 28:24
<b>recommendation</b> 13:15 47:1	<b>remaining</b> 6:9	<b>responses</b> 6:24
<b>recommendations</b> 30:2	<b>remark</b> 44:24	<b>responsibility</b> 6:17 31:12
<b>recommends</b> 5:23	<b>remedy</b> 35:18	<b>resume</b> 18:5
<b>red</b> 46:19	<b>removing</b> 15:16	<b>retains</b> 43:8
<b>redundancies</b> 25:18	<b>rep-</b> 24:10	<b>review</b> 36:4
<b>redundant</b> 4:1	<b>repeat</b> 16:17 37:8	<b>reviewing</b> 18:19 19:7
<b>reemphasize</b> 44:17	<b>repre-</b> 42:8	<b>revising</b> 5:23
<b>refer</b> 6:1	<b>representation</b> 24:8,23 25:12 26:5 28:5,10,12 38:5,11,14,23 39:6 40:1, 10,24 43:2,9	<b>revisions</b> 30:6
<b>reference</b> 3:23 9:13 47:5	<b>representatives</b> 22:11	<b>Rice</b> 3:4,6,7,14,17 4:19,23 5:6,9 9:10,16,23 10:8 11:6,15 12:1
<b>referenced</b> 30:3	<b>representing</b> 3:5 26:9,15, 21	<b>rights</b> 24:16
<b>references</b> 6:19	<b>request</b> 12:6 24:16 27:14	<b>ring</b> 35:9,11
<b>referring</b> 34:1	<b>requesting</b> 13:12 27:20	<b>Ritina(phonetic)</b> 22:7
<b>refine</b> 21:5	<b>require</b> 31:13	<b>Rochford</b> 22:2,4,5 23:8 25:23 27:1,6,23 28:11 29:3,6 37:14 41:14 44:15
<b>refrains</b> 45:6	<b>required</b> 3:20 15:18 25:10	<b>role</b> 24:19
<b>regard</b> 32:21 43:16,24	<b>requirement</b> 22:23 28:17 30:10 44:22 47:7,9	<b>room</b> 2:21 41:4
<b>registration</b> 16:20,22,24 17:7	<b>requirements</b> 3:4,20 4:1 14:21 15:24 16:2 18:15,16	<b>rude</b> 2:9
<b>regular</b> 41:11		
<b>rejected</b> 34:21 45:8,13		

**rule** 3:3,15,19 4:12 5:4,12,  
23 6:7,11,14,19,21 7:5,6,  
7,10,22 8:19 9:1 10:3,5,6,  
11,19,21 11:1,11,18,21  
12:9 13:6 14:14 15:3,15,  
18,24 16:2,3,7,9,11,13,14,  
16 17:17 18:8,10 19:4,6,  
12 21:18,19,23,24 22:22,  
23 23:1,3,11,12,13,14,15,  
18,20,22 24:7,11,12,22  
25:17 29:17 30:6 32:2  
34:15,19 35:21 36:1 37:14  
38:2 39:7,11 41:8 43:3,17  
44:6,19,22 46:3,15

**rules** 2:2 6:5 10:14 12:12  
13:4 16:8 17:12 22:13  
28:9 31:12 34:23 36:8

---

## S

---

**Sanjay** 29:11

**satisfied** 30:11

**satisfy** 16:1

**Saturday** 14:2

**schedule** 2:8 12:24

**school** 14:20

**schools** 14:16,19,20 15:4

**Schuster** 11:11

**Schuster's** 21:16

**scope** 38:18 44:5

**score** 6:16 7:7,11 8:6  
10:1,20 11:2,8 12:2,4,6  
14:16 19:2

**scores** 7:17,24 8:17  
12:13,19,21 13:19 15:3

**section** 9:12 23:10

**seek** 3:20 24:7 28:7

**seeking** 3:18,23 5:12  
31:20

**seeks** 4:2 6:12 22:22 30:4

**selection** 6:2

**self-defeating** 32:11

**self-represent** 29:23  
30:22

**self-represented** 46:10

**send** 35:22

**sense** 43:11 44:17

**sentiment** 41:21

**September** 36:2

**serve** 34:13

**set** 6:18 15:24

**setting** 6:16

**settings** 21:11

**shoot** 40:14

**shown** 30:19

**shows** 18:21

**side** 15:2 42:13

**sign** 24:13

**signature** 36:12

**significant** 18:19

**similar** 9:2

**simplifies** 25:17

**simply** 31:4 33:16 47:5

**simultaneously** 27:20  
28:4

**sit** 14:20 16:17

**sites** 20:23 21:9 23:4

**sitting** 8:16

**situation** 31:5 43:10 44:2  
45:13

**SJD** 4:4

**SLR** 30:16

**solution** 43:7

**sort** 19:24 31:4 44:3

**Soucie** 19:19,24 41:9

**speak** 2:18 3:10 13:4 22:8  
25:3

**speaker** 2:17 3:4 47:20

**speakers** 2:7

**speaking** 3:13 24:3

**special** 13:8

**specific** 4:12 6:1,2 9:13,  
18 13:2 34:17 39:20 43:5,  
19

**specifically** 6:12 9:17  
13:1 30:6

**spend** 18:19 19:7 33:21

**SRL** 30:24 31:23 32:6 46:9

**SRLS** 29:23,24 30:5  
31:18,19 32:23,24 33:3,9,  
16

**staff** 3:7 8:12 18:19

**stakeholders** 29:22

**stand** 47:21

**standard** 8:7

**standardize** 34:19

**standards** 34:17,24 35:3,  
18 36:3,9,13

**start** 2:10 21:9 22:18

**started** 2:6,19 3:1

**state** 7:10 9:2 22:21 24:7,  
23 28:9 45:16

**stated** 10:16

**statement** 25:13 28:17



38:22,23 39:5 41:15,23	<b>suggestions</b> 19:1 24:4 25:24 29:19	<b>terms</b> 12:18 13:7
<b>statements</b> 40:21	<b>suggests</b> 7:5,16 21:17 23:9 46:9	<b>test</b> 8:1,4 9:14 11:20 20:23
<b>states</b> 7:7 25:18	<b>Sunday</b> 14:2	<b>testing</b> 21:5
<b>stating</b> 15:23	<b>supplies</b> 17:15	<b>tests</b> 11:22
<b>statute</b> 37:22	<b>support</b> 4:15 17:10	<b>things</b> 32:3
<b>step</b> 25:7 27:5 38:7 43:3 45:3	<b>supported</b> 22:19 23:16	<b>thought</b> 33:6 40:18 41:9
<b>stepped</b> 38:1	<b>supportive</b> 37:16 44:22 45:17	<b>thoughts</b> 41:24
<b>steps</b> 26:13	<b>supports</b> 7:2	<b>Thursday</b> 13:3
<b>strongly</b> 37:10	<b>suppose</b> 42:14	<b>tighten</b> 6:10
<b>structure</b> 16:11,13 18:9 19:14 20:13 21:18 30:7	<b>Supreme</b> 2:2 3:3,19 16:8 29:16,17 34:13 44:21 45:5	<b>time</b> 8:11,20 10:4,9 11:20 12:3 13:11 16:17,23 17:9 18:19 19:7,11 20:5 24:9, 24 25:5 26:5,9 27:8,13 28:12,19 29:3 33:21 36:14 38:9,16 42:10,17 45:20 47:17
<b>stuck</b> 27:17	<b>symmetry</b> 15:6	<b>today</b> 2:2,6,19 28:23 37:11
<b>study</b> 30:2	<b>system</b> 4:11 31:2,18 33:13,18	<b>toes</b> 25:7
<b>subject</b> 36:5	<hr/> <b>T</b> <hr/>	<b>told</b> 20:12 31:9
<b>submit</b> 12:6 13:11,13 18:2 39:9	<b>Tailor</b> 29:11,12 32:8,15,18 33:8,24 34:7 45:22	<b>topic</b> 45:14
<b>submits</b> 18:21 42:4	<b>taking</b> 9:17 15:7 33:5	<b>track</b> 13:23
<b>submitted</b> 2:15 3:21 5:15 7:1,3 18:13 37:18 45:23	<b>talk</b> 10:11 24:5 29:9	<b>tracking</b> 11:20
<b>subsection</b> 23:10 30:6,17	<b>talked</b> 41:13	<b>traditional</b> 7:15
<b>subsequent</b> 18:3	<b>talking</b> 10:10,17 12:24 36:20	<b>traditionally</b> 8:12
<b>substance</b> 30:17	<b>target</b> 14:1	<b>training</b> 36:5
<b>substantive</b> 4:6	<b>technical</b> 46:12	<b>trainings</b> 36:2
<b>substantively</b> 21:22	<b>technological</b> 31:1,13 33:10	<b>transfer</b> 12:6 14:16 15:2
<b>sufficiently</b> 25:21	<b>technology</b> 31:1 33:9	<b>transferred</b> 10:20
<b>suggest</b> 42:2 46:8,13 47:4	<b>ten</b> 2:8	<b>transition</b> 5:17,22
<b>suggested</b> 5:16 7:13 23:19,22 24:21,22 25:2,16 27:2 28:1,3,11,22 47:8	<b>terminates</b> 38:11	<b>transitional</b> 6:23 15:17
<b>suggesting</b> 24:11 25:15 28:14	<b>termination</b> 40:3,24	<b>trial</b> 24:12,19 38:15 42:8, 10,16,23 43:7,9 45:15
<b>suggestion</b> 21:21 28:4		

<b>Tuesday</b> 12:17 14:6,8	<b>vice</b> 34:12	<b>writing</b> 24:16
<b>turn</b> 14:12	<b>view</b> 38:6 39:2	<b>written</b> 2:14,15
<b>two-day</b> 8:7		<b>wrote</b> 41:15
<b>type</b> 43:10 46:14	<b>W</b>	
<b>typically</b> 12:20,21,22	<b>wait</b> 21:18 27:4	<b>Y</b>
<b>U</b>	<b>wanted</b> 9:20 10:4 37:11 40:15 44:8,10,16	<b>year</b> 10:1 34:14
<b>U.S.</b> 4:10 5:1 14:24	<b>warranted</b> 4:12	<b>years</b> 6:22 7:8 8:21 12:4 15:1 17:13 19:2 20:3,7
<b>UBE</b> 5:20 9:17 10:20 11:2 14:16 15:7,9	<b>ways</b> 40:12	<b>York</b> 19:2
<b>un-</b> 25:22	<b>website</b> 23:2 44:21	
<b>understand</b> 6:24 19:21 41:12,19	<b>Wednesday</b> 2:3 9:2 11:4,9 12:5,12,14,17 14:4,6,9	
<b>understanding</b> 4:13 26:21	<b>week</b> 11:4 12:5 13:2,5,24 14:4	
<b>understood</b> 34:20	<b>weeks</b> 12:19	
<b>uneasy</b> 37:24	<b>weigh</b> 37:4	
<b>uniform</b> 5:19 9:13 36:9	<b>well-established</b> 46:3	
<b>universally</b> 23:1	<b>whichever</b> 39:17	
<b>universe</b> 35:13	<b>wi-fi</b> 20:22	
<b>unrepresented</b> 24:20	<b>wills</b> 47:13	
<b>upcoming</b> 5:17,22	<b>window</b> 26:7	
<b>uploading</b> 21:7	<b>wire</b> 21:6	
<b>V</b>	<b>wireless</b> 21:6	
<b>valid</b> 7:8,11 8:6	<b>withdraw</b> 26:12	
<b>varies</b> 13:21	<b>wo-</b> 22:23	
<b>variety</b> 7:21	<b>word</b> 42:8,11,12	
<b>vendor</b> 21:1	<b>wording</b> 28:18	
<b>version</b> 6:2 8:19 15:7 46:5,11	<b>words</b> 37:20	
<b>versions</b> 46:17	<b>work</b> 2:22 3:24 19:5 21:9 30:1 31:6 42:22,23	
<b>vetted</b> 29:17	<b>worked</b> 8:20 27:22	
	<b>works</b> 7:22 17:23	