

**From:** [Joanne Gagliardi](#)  
**To:** [RulesCommittee](#)  
**Subject:** Proposed Change to Rule 207 Witness reading and signing transcripts  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 27, 2022 11:24:23 AM

---

Good morning,

It has come to my attention there is a proposed change to Supreme Court Rule 207 regarding witnesses reading and signing of their transcripts.

I am a court reporter who has been licensed in the State of Illinois since 1981, 41 years. I would like to be heard on this proposed change. The role of court reporters is very important to the court system. This is how we make a living, and it is a difficult job. Training is 2 /12 to 3 years and there is a large expense to buy equipment and computers just to start in the profession. To take and give away our work product would be harmful and possibly even detrimental to the profession as a whole.

As it stands now, when a witness does not waive signature after their deposition and wishes to read and sign their transcript, court reporters provide them the opportunity to come into our office to read and sign their depositions. This has been in place for as long as I have been a court reporter. NEVER have we been agreeable to provide the deponent/witness a FREE copy of our work product.

I am not sure who is behind this proposed change. I know that one who would benefit financially is the attorney representing the witness who would not have to pay for our work product. Normally when the deponent is represented by an attorney and wishes to "reserve" their signature on their deposition, the attorney who is representing them has the opportunity to "order a copy" of that transcript and thus provide it to the deponent for reading and signing. If that attorney does not wish to order a copy of the transcript, we send a letter directing the witnesses to a location agreed upon by us for them to appear to read and sign. Also when the attorney is involved with obtaining signature, they have more "control." They provide the witness with a copy that they have paid the court reporter for. They can assure that the witness reads and signs it in the time allotted and it gets distributed to all parties. This would be a burden put on the court reporter to chase down a witness to get their signed signature page and errata sheets back, and it is not our responsibility to take the time to do this.

The ramifications of "providing" a witness a FREE copy of their deposition are far reaching. Why would opposing counsel ever want to order a transcript when they can receive a "copy" from the deponent? It is utterly ridiculous to think that our work product will not be "STOLEN" from us. Why would court reporters want to stay in a profession when their hard-earned income is taken away.

I implore the Rules Committee to take a hard look at the very real outcome to the court reporting profession if this proposed change is passed. It will be one more nail in the State of Illinois coffin and one more reason for certified shorthand reporters to seek work elsewhere, far from the State of Illinois.

I appreciate your time and attention and would urge you to vote NO on this proposed change.

Sincerely,

Joanne M. Gagliardi, Precise Reporting Service, PC\_  
License No. 084-002466