

From: [Tracy Jones](#)
To: [RulesCommittee](#)
Subject: OPPOSITION TO Proposal 21-06 (P R. 0299) to Amend Supreme Court Rule 207
Date: Wednesday, September 28, 2022 9:33:35 PM

Committee Members,

I am a Certified Shorthand Reporter in good standing in the State of Illinois. For over 20 years I have had the privilege of serving the legal community in Illinois and hope to continue to do so for some time to come.

I am writing to express my opposition to Proposal 21-06 (P.R. 0299) to Amend Illinois Supreme Court Rule 207. The proposed change, in summary, would require Court Reporters (CRs) to provide no-cost portable transcript copies for non-party witness reserved signature review. At present, most CRs provide time and opportunity for reserved signature review without providing a portable copy of the transcript, thus affording the witness the opportunity to review the transcript while protecting the work product and revenue stream of the reporter. In-person review and sign procedures are generally at the convenience of the witness and impose no undue burden to the parties, the witness, or the CR.

The proposed amendment includes a provision in Rule 207 that would effectively force CRs to provide free work product and simultaneously provide an avenue for multiple parties to receive transcript copies at no cost. As the overwhelming majority of court reporters bill for transcripts (as opposed to bulk contracts or hourly billing structures), requiring CRs to provide no-cost conveyable transcript copies is an imposition of undue financial penalty and flies in the face of all principles of fair trade.

Technological advancements and the trend toward exclusively electronic transcript formats have made it increasingly difficult for court reporters to protect their work product. Court Reporters are highly skilled, extensively trained, licensed professionals. It is the height of unreasonableness to require CRs to provide services requiring the expenditure of their time and effort at no cost. The proposed amendment suggests exactly this. Compelling Court Reporters to provide a portative transcript at no cost simply because the witness is a disinterested party is an absurd suggestion, particularly since reasonable options for completion of reserved signature certification already exist.

Proposal 21-06 advances a proposition which disproportionately burdens Court Reporters where no burden to attorneys, parties, or witnesses currently exists, and is therefore unmerited and unreasonable.

In the interest of fair trade and the preservation of professional dignity, I urge you to strike Proposal 21-06 (P.R. 0299) and deny the proposed amendment to Supreme Court Rule 207.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tracy Jones, CSR, RPR, CLR
IL CSR 083-004553



Tracy Jones, CSR, RPR, CLR
Licensed Certified Shorthand Reporter
President
312.535.2542
info@lit3c.com

3C Litigation Support, Inc.
Courtesy, Commitment, Consistency
lit3c.com

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION: Any communication from this email address can be from the owner, authorized personnel, and/or hired consultant. This email message and any attachment may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which the email is addressed. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, that person is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us as soon as possible by telephone (collect calls will be accepted). Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.