



SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE
STATE OF NEVADA

CONNIE J. STEINHEIMER
DISTRICT JUDGE
DEPARTMENT FOUR

75 COURT STREET
P.O. Box 30083
RENO, NEVADA 89520-3083
(775) 328-3183

August 28, 2009

FILED

Chief Justice James Hardesty
c/o Tracie K. Lindeman
Clerk of the Supreme Court
201 South Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701-4702

SEP 01 2009
TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *[Signature]*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

RE: ADKT No. 424
Second Judicial District Court Response to July 20, 2009 Order

Dear Chief Justice:

On behalf of the Second Judicial District Court Judges, please allow this letter to serve as the entire Court's report regarding the arrangements and/or equipment that have been installed to ensure compliance with the requirements ADKT No. 424.

Each Judge has a "bat phone" to allow for the telephonic appearance by parties in the Department's Courtroom and/or Chambers. Additionally, the Second Judicial District Court has the availability to conduct video conference hearings in its large conference room. The Court is exploring the feasibility to have video conference hearings in courtrooms. However, funding has not been secured to accomplish this goal. This goal will allow the Court to have more confidence as to whom is actually appearing at the hearing. Some departments have reported experiencing problems with paralegals and legal assistants appearing in lieu of counsel when the appearance is only telephonic.

Additionally, the following are responses to specific rules stated in ADKT No. 424:

Rule 4(1) Circumstances in which appearance by communication equipment shall be allowed.

It is the policy of all Second Judicial District Court Judges to allow telephonic appearances at all the hearings/conferences as stated in this rule.

09-31753

Additionally, it has been found that evidence intensive hearings do not work well in the telephonic communication medium. Therefore, pursuant to Rule 4(3)(b), the Judges of this District usually require the personal appearance of the parties, especially pro per litigants, at such hearings.

Rule 4(5) Notice by party

It is the Judges' intention to allow the parties to a case every opportunity to appear by telephone. The Court has the ability to quickly handle two parties on a conference call. If a case has more than two parties that must be conferenced, the Court will request one of the parties to set up a multi-party conference call with an outside vendor of their choosing, at the parties expense.

Rule 4(8) Audibility and procedure

It is the policy of all Second Judicial District Court Judges to ensure that the statements of the participants are audible to all other participants, court staff, and the court reporter (if applicable). Additionally, the Judges are complying with the requirements as stated in Rule 4(8)(b).

Rule 4(10) Conference call provider


The Second Judicial District Court has not designated a particular conference call provider that must be used. In most departments, the attorney who is requesting the telephonic appearance is free to choose and pay the provider of their choice. Department Seven has designated Courtcall.

Rule 4(11) Information on communication equipment appearances

The Second Judicial District Court has published a notice providing parties with the particular information necessary for them to appear by communication equipment at conferences, hearings and proceedings on its website. In addition, a copy of ADKT No. 424 has been posted. Finally, the Second Judicial District Court has published a notice in the Washoe County Bar publication the Writ.

Should you have any questions or concerns regarding any of the above, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Judge Connie Steinheimer
Chief Judge, Second Judicial District Court

cc: All Second Judicial District Court Judges
Howard Conyers, District Court Administrator and Clerk of Court
Joey Orduna, Assistant Court Administrator – Family Division