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I. BACKGROUND OF THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ASSIGNMENT

On June 30, 1986 EMT received a written request for technical assistance services from the Connecticut Office of the Chief Court Administrator. Specifically, the Chief Court Administrator's Office requested assistance in identifying computer software and hardware that could be implemented at a reasonable cost to track all Connecticut Appellate cases and to index pending and recently decided appellate cases. The purpose of the proposed system is to provide management information to the Supreme and Appellate Court Clerks office and the Chief Staff Attorney's office in their efforts to reduce court delay.

The Office of the Chief Court Administrator also requested that expeditious attention be provided this assignment because the Court's FY 1987 budget submission was due by August 1, 1986. Consequently the technical assistance report would have to be received by the Court Administrator no later than July 21, 1986.

Upon receipt of the TA request, EMT contacted the Bureau of Justice Assistance's (BJA) Project Director, Jay Marshall, and provided background information on the proposed assignment. Based on BJA's initial acceptance of the assignment for screening, EMT prepared a proposed workplan and budget for the assignment. The workplan was submitted to, reviewed by, and verbally approved by Mr. Marshall on June 30, 1986.

Due to the urgency of the request and the limited time for completion of the assignment, EMT was unable to secure the services of an expert-practitioner from the field for this
assignment. Consequently EMT project staff member - James Dimm- conducted the on-site work and prepared this report.

On July 7-9 Mr. Dimm was on-site in Hartford and met with the following court officials:

Mr. James Cavanaugh - Executive Director of Administrative Services

Ms. Barbara Rodges - Chief Staff Attorney

Ms. Ruth Taxsar - Deputy Chief Staff Attorney

Mr. Francis Drumm Jr. - Chief Clerk of the Appellate and Supreme Court

Ms. Beth Bickley - Systems Analyst - Judicial Information Systems
The remainder of this report identifies the organizational structure and jurisdiction of the users of the proposed system, defines the system requirements for client agencies and identifies systems options for meeting these requirements.

II. ORGANIZATION AND JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME AND APPELLATE COURT IN CONNECTICUT

The end users of the proposed case tracking and issue indexing system would be the Clerk of the Appellate and Supreme Court and the Chief Staff Attorney's office. Both of these agencies serve in a support capacity to the Appellate Court and the Supreme Court. In this section of the TA report we define these two courts and their relative jurisdictions.

SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court is the state's highest court. It is composed of the Chief Justice, who is head of the Judicial Department, and five associate justices. All are also judges of the Superior Court. The Supreme Court is a constitutional, state-maintained court whose members are appointed for eight-year terms by the General Assembly upon the nomination of the Governor.

By law, the Supreme Court hears appeals from final judgments
or actions of the Superior Court in the following cases:

- any matter brought pursuant to the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court under the constitution;

- appeals pending in the Appellate Court that the Supreme Court decides it should hear and transfer to itself;

- an appeal in any matter where the Superior Court declares a state statute or state constitutional provision to be involved;

- an appeal in any criminal action involving a conviction for a capital felony, class A felony or other felony for which the maximum sentence which may be imposed exceeds twenty years;

- review of a death sentence;

- an election or primary dispute;

- an appeal of any reprimand or censure of a probate judge;

- any matter regarding judicial removal or suspension of a judge;

- appeals from decisions of the judicial review
council;
- matters involving substantial public interest;
- writs of error;
- any other matter provided by law.

An appeal of a decision by the Appellate Court is heard by the Supreme Court only if it grants certification upon petition.

As Connecticut's court of last resort, the Supreme Court is responsible for instituting its own rules of practice and procedure. With certain exceptions for those employees whose salaries are fixed by statute, the Supreme Court also establishes the personnel policies and compensation plan for the employees of the Judicial Department. 1
In November, 1982, Connecticut's voters ratified an amendment to the state constitution which authorized the creation of a constitutional intermediate appellate court. This action was necessary because the statutorily-created Appellate Session of the Superior Court, with its limited jurisdiction, could not alleviate the caseload burden on the Supreme Court which, by the Fall of 1982, had increased to nearly 1,000 cases.

The 1983 session of the General Assembly established a five member Appellate Court, effective July 1, 1983. It replaced the Appellate Session of the Superior Court, which ceased to exist after June 30, 1983, except for those cases which had been heard by the court in which no decision had been rendered. The jurisdiction of the Appellate Court was also established as all cases where there is not a right of direct appeal to the Supreme Court.

The Appellate Court is the Court of first (and usually last) appeal. This new court was designed to free the Supreme Court of a substantial backlog of cases while providing an avenue of direct and speedy appeal to the states litigants.
III. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE APPELLATE AND SUPREME COURT CLERK AND THE CHIEF STAFF ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

In this section we present a brief description of the roles and responsibilities of the Appellate and Supreme Court Clerk's office and the office of the Chief Staff Attorney.

CLERK OF THE APPELLATE AND SUPREME COURT

The position of Chief Clerk of the Appellate and Supreme Court is authorized by Title 51-201 of the Connecticut statutes. That section provides that the "justices of the Supreme Court shall appoint a chief clerk of the Supreme Court who shall not be a chief clerk of any judicial district." The statute further provides that the clerk of the Supreme Court "shall also be the Chief Clerk of the Appellate Court."

The Chief Clerk is responsible for maintaining the dockets for both the Supreme and the Appellate Court. This includes the docketing and scheduling of cases that will be heard by each of the courts.

According to the most recent statistics there are approximately 1200 new filings per year in the appellate courts and approximately 1,000 dispositions. All information on cases is maintained manually.
The processing of appeal cases begins with the receipt of the appeal from either the attorney for the appellant or a copy of the appeal form from the clerk of the trial court. The trial court copy of the appeal form must be received before processing continues.

The case is assigned a number for the court to which the appeal is filed. The amount of fee paid, as noted by the trial court clerk on his copy, indicates to which court the appeal is filed. The clerk also dates his copy with the date received and signs it.

A log book is maintained for each court for the assignment of numbers. The log books include the name of the case, the number assigned, the trial court location and its docket number. When cases are transferred, it is noted in the log book next to the new number assigned and the original number has a cross-reference as to which number it was transferred to.

Index cards are then prepared, one for the first named plaintiff and one for the first named defendant. The index card includes the names of the parties and the format of the names indicates which is the plaintiff and which is the defendant. The card also includes the trial court location and docket number and the appeal number assigned to the case. Index cards are called locator cards since they are kept indefinitely for future reference.

A face sheet is filled out. There is one for each type of
court. This is placed in the front of the file. A case label with assigned number is prepared. The file folder may end up with more than one number on the label if multiple appeals result from one trial court docket number. If there are multiple trial court docket numbers, there will be a separate file folder for each.

Index cards are prepared for each case and used to create the docket. These cards are filed numerically and are updated as the case proceeds. The data on these cards includes: appeal number, trial court location, name of the case, attorneys and a designation as to whose appeal, i.e. defendant's appeal from the trial court.

Another index card is prepared with appropriate names and addresses and filed alphabetically. The trial court file need not be present before processing continues. (Trial court files usually takes a month to arrive.)

A Scripto card (for mailing purposes) is prepared for each attorney. It includes his name and address and the AC or SC docket number. Scripto cards are kept in the pocket of the file folder.

The last task in this initial processing is to make as many copies of the clerk's copy of the appeal form as there are attorneys and mail a copy with the number highlighted to each attorney involved.

Both the Clerk and Counsel's copy of the appeal form is kept in the file. Eventually, 2 copies of the Record, (the condensed
trial court case) goes into the file as well. The Record is actually a subset of the trial court file that contains the paperwork from the court that is germane to the appeal. It could be the entire trial court file.

Preparation of the Record is done by the law clerks. For Juvenile and Criminal cases, since they go to the top of the ready list, the law clerk is alerted to the need to prepare the Record as soon as the first brief is filed. A SC case is not "ready" until all briefs are filed, the Record has been printed and distributed, no delaying motions have been filed and the last brief was filed at least 20 days prior. For AC cases, the Record does not need to be done for the case to be printed on the docket, but it will need to be done prior to assignment. The white cards are marked with colored tapes for quick reference as to the status of a case:

- Green - 1 brief filed
- Yellow - 2 briefs filed
- Blue - Record done
- Red - Ready

A Supreme Court case is not ready until the Record has been printed and distributed to counsel and the 20-day waiting period for reply briefs has elapsed. An Appellate Court case is ready when all briefs are in and the 20-day waiting period for reply briefs has elapsed. Ready determination is not made in either instance until green card (docket card) is checked to be sure no
motions for extension (or any others) are pending. The extension date is recorded on the green card.

The Record is prepared as follows:

- Law Clerks use rules and discretion
- Attorney may include a Designation of Contents of the Record (PB 3012B) and that serves as guide for the law clerks

After the Record is printed and distributed, attorneys may make a motion to correct it. Justices in conference hear these motions and may or may not order correction of the record. In any event, the entire trial court file is available for Justices even after the Record is set.

A log is kept of Records:

- Case #
- Name of Case
- Date copies received (trial court copies)
- Who assigned to (law clerk)
- When goes to Brescia (printer)
- Checked on return for number of pages and accuracy
- To COLP with number of copies needed returned in booklet form

We estimate that, including new case filings, motions updates, status inquiries and depositions, there are approximately 50,000 transactions per year that occur in the Chief Clerk's Office. As noted above all of these transactions...
are currently performed manually. Automation of this process would speed up the availability of up-to-date information to the judiciary as well as the private bar.

**CHIEF STAFF ATTORNEY**

The Office of the Chief Staff Attorney was created in 1982 to provide legal research support services to the Appellate and Supreme Courts. With a staff compliment of twelve full and part-time staff, the Office of the Chief Staff Attorney is responsible for:

- Preparing approximately 100 bench memos per year
  - review motions filed
  - check number of briefs filed
  - address procedural and jurisdictional problems
  - review exhibits and transcripts
  - discuss proposed rescripts in complex cases
- Preparing supplemental memos when requested
- Maintaining an in-house digest of all cases in the Supreme and Appellate Courts as they appear in the Law Journal
- Maintain data base of issues indexed by subject area
o Developing a Settlement Program

- review cases prior to assignment for settlement conference
- screen out jurisdictionally defective cases and appeals otherwise ineligible for the Settlement program
- prepare case memoranda on those cases deemed appropriate for settlement
- prepare package of settlement materials for the settlement judge
- assist the settlement judge in post-conference follow-up

o Acting as Practice Book Specialists

o Responding to unusual filings

o Acting as LEXIS specialists

In order to facilitate what has become a burdensome manual process, the Chief Staff Attorney's Office has in recent months attempted to automate both the recording of pending case information for the identification of common issues and the recording of the opinions in published cases for research purposes. The present software and hardware which they are using are inadequate for their needs, and it would appear that both they and the Chief Clerk's Office could benefit from automated systems that could share at least some of the information each requires.
The next section of this report presents the information requirements of both the Chief Clerk and the Chief Staff Attorney.

IV. INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS

The information requirements contained in this section are designed to meet the needs of both the Chief Clerk and the Chief Staff Attorney.

The Chief Clerk requires an on-line case tracking and document production system capable of handling a caseload of approximately 1,000 cases.

The Chief Staff Attorney requires an on-line multi-user system capable of indexing issues in current and recently decided cases. The issues that will be indexed are included here as Attachment A. There would be approximately 1,500 cases on the indexing system, however, approximately two-thirds of these cases would also be active on the Clerks system. Consequently, if an integrated system is selected, these cases would only be entered once. If two stand-alone systems are selected, each case would most likely have to be entered twice thus increasing the amount of data entry.

The remainder of this section presents the System Requirements as defined by Ms. Beth Bickley (Judicial Information Systems) in consultation with the Chief Clerk and the Chief Staff Attorney.
A. Information Available:

- Appellate or Supreme Court number assigned
- Name of case
- Names of all parties
- Names and addresses of all counsel (Use of Juris numbers)
- Source of appeal (Trial court or other source)
- Facts about lower court case
- Filing of PB Section 3012 papers
- Preliminary Statement of Issues
- Certificate Re: Transcript
- Designation of Parts of File for Record
- Transfers
- Filing of Briefs
- Filing of Cross-appeal and Briefs
- Filing of Motions
- Motion orders
- Filing of Exhibits
- Assigning of Record
- Printing of Record
- Docket
- Assignment
- Disposition
B. Information Maintained:

Research File

- Name of Case
- Docket Number
- Status
- Cite
- Subject Area(s)
- Statutes
- Practice Book Sections:
  - Action, Form/Cause of
  - Appellate Prosecutor and Judge
- Attorneys
- Con Law
- Damages
- Defenses
- Equity
- Evidence
- Final Judgment
- Jury Instructions
- Lower Court Prosecutor and Judge
- Parties
- Convicted of
- Entry Date
- Last Update
- Bench Memo Writer
- Text Area(s)
Final Judgment File

- Case Identifiers (Name and number)
- When reviewed
- Who reviewed
- Decision *
- Why - key words

Preparation of Bench Memo

- Case identifiers (Name and number)
- When assigned
- When prepared *
- Final delineation of issues *
- Sources of potential procedural problems

C. Basic Processing Requirements:

- Ability to inquire upon basic case records maintained in Chief Clerk's Office
- Ability to receive basic case data from Chief Clerk's Office for initiating Research File cases
- Ability to enter, update and maintain Bench Memo information, Subject Matte File information, Final Judgement File information and Research File information
- Ability to restrict entering, updating and maintenance capabilities to certain users
o Ability to provide read-only access to certain Research File cases

D. Special Processing Capabilities

Ability to search files and text on Research File records using a key word -- particularly for the identification of common issues in pending cases

Ability to perform multiple option searches including backward paging.

E. Printing Capabilities:

   o Ability to print contents of Research File case when desired
   o Ability to print ad hoc reports for groups of cases on the Research File
   o Ability to request printing of Subject Matter or Final Judgment File case

F. Word Processing Requirements:

Access to a word processing program for the production of Bench Memos.

*Note: Information that is contained in items marked with an asterisk (*) can be transmitted back to the Chief Clerk's Office
for updating of basic case records.

In the next section of this report we identify system options available to the Connecticut Judicial Department to meet the processing requirements of the Chief Clerk's Office and the Chief Staff Attorney's office.

G. System Options

Prior to contacting EMT and initiating this TA request the Connecticut Judicial Department solicited a proposal from Wang Computer Company for a system solution to the information requirements of the Clerk of Court and Chief Staff Attorney's operations.

The proposal submitted by Wang recommended separate software packages for the Clerk of Court and Chief Staff Attorney operating on a single central processor. The Judicial Department was concerned that separate software packages would not provide the level of system integration desired by the Courts. Further, there was a concern that the total cost of the proposed system by Wang (in excess of $280,000) was excessive given the limited caseload of the Appellate Courts.

Consequently, the Judicial Department requested that EMT review the Appellate Court's system requirements, review the Wang proposal, and suggest alternative system solutions that could meet the court's requirements.

To this end, EMT has reviewed the Wang proposal and contacted a number of vendors to determine whether alternative
systems that meet the Court's requirements exist and, if so, approximate costs for these systems.

In the remainder of this section we identify possible system solutions with approximate and implementation costs for each. It should be noted, however, that given the limited amount of time to complete this assignment. EMT staff did not have an opportunity to see live demonstrations of any of the systems discussed in the remainder of this report. Most of the information contained herein is directly from vendors selling these systems. Consequently, EMT cannot make a definitive recommendation as to which system would best meet the requirements of the Judicial Department.

It should also be noted that vendors have proposed various system configurations with differing numbers of printers and terminals depending on how they package systems. Finally, some vendors have packaged software maintenance services in their cost estimates while others have not. Consequently, exact dollar comparisons should not be made based on these numbers.

We recommend that the Judicial Department use these system descriptions as a broad guideline for comparing systems. We also recommend that the Judicial Department issue a Request for Proposals so that all vendors can be compared from an equal basis.

The following vendors have been identified as having systems that could meet the Chief Clerk and Chief Staff Attorney's requirements. It should be noted all of the vendor packages
would require some level of customization to meet the end user needs. The extent of this customization will be more clearly defined during the RFP process.

Finally, vendors were not provided sufficient information regarding telecommunication requirements. All were informed that terminals and printers would be located in two different buildings (within 2 blocks) and at least two different locations within each of the two buildings. Consequently, telecommunication requirements will have to be more carefully defined for vendors during the RFP process.

WANG COMPUTER COMPANY

Wang submitted a proposal for a Wang VS 15 and VS 65 configuration using the Rhode Island Appellate Court software for case tracking and a proprietary package called STATUS for the issue indexing. The case tracking software would require customization to meet the Courts requirements. According to court officials who attended a demonstration of STATUS, that package would require little, if any, modification.

SYSTEM SUMMARY

CASE TRACKING

SOFTWARE: Transfer Rhode Island Appellate Court System. Approximate
ISSUE INDEXING

SOFTWARE:

STATUS, a proprietary package available from CP International Inc. approximate cost with minor modification and conversion of exiting data is $40,000

HARDWARE:

Wang VS 6R configuration with 23 workstations and 8 printers of which 6 are laser printers is $150,000

ANALYSIS:

It appears that if the Rhode Island software contained issue indexing (so that a separate package would not be necessary) and if the system would operate on a smaller VS configuration with fewer work stations, then the Wang proposal would be technically and price competitive. We believe that the total cost of the Wang solution as presented
(approximately $250,000) is high given the relatively low caseload and lack of application complexity.

BR SYSTEMS INC.

BR Systems is a division of the Stenograph Corporation. BR reports that their court software package integrates case tracking and issue indexing functions in a single application software package.

BR is currently operational in trial level courts in four Oklahoma courts; Kane County, Illinois; Middlesex County, New Jersey; and Ann Arbor, Michigan. This software would have to be modified to accommodate the unique requirements of Appellate Courts.

SYSTEMS SUMMARY

CASE TRACKING SOFTWARE : Proprietary package owned by BR Systems Inc. license fee for the software is $85,000. BR estimates that approximately $25,000 of modifications would be required to customize the
software to meet the court's requirements. BR also charges an installation and training fee that usually costs $25,000. Total estimated software cost is approximately $135,000.

**ISSUE INDEXING SOFTWARE:** Included in and integrated with the case tracking software described above.

**HARDWARE:** BR's software operates on IBM 4300 series computers operating under CICS. The approximate cost of a configuration with 20 workstations and 8 printers is $200,000.

**ANALYSIS:** Although integration of the case tracking and issue indexing is not a priority requirement of the court we believe that,
long term, a single integrated system will be easier for the court to maintain and a single configuration will facilitate information sharing between the clerks and staff attorney's operations. The cost of the BR software is approximately $135,000. The cost of the IBM hardware places their total price at approximately $135,000 which is more than the courts are probably willing -- and should have -- to pay for a system. If this software could be operated on existing state IBM equipment, the total cost would be more competitive with other vendors.
MAXSTAR

MAXSTAR is a proprietary package marketed by MAXIMUS, Inc. MAXSTAR is a generic casetracking system that has an indexing capability that could be used for issue indexing. The Connecticut Courts suggested reviewing this package because it could integrate with the judicial productivity monitoring system (MAXPAR) that the Connecticut Courts are currently using.

SYSTEM SUMMARY

CASE TRACKING SOFTWARE : A proprietary software package, MAXSTAR, that is licensed for $30,000 plus modifications that must be made to the generic package that are estimated to cost $45,000. The vendor estimates an additional $10,000 for installation and training.
ISSUE INDEXING SOFTWARE: Included in application software

HARDWARE: The vendor recommends an NCR Tower configuration with 16 workstations and 7 printers for a total configuration price of $65,000.

ANALYSIS: This system has not been installed in other court locations consequently, an assessment of its applicability cannot be made. Court users in Connecticut express satisfaction with the productively system that has been installed in the courts. We recommend
an analyzing the
functionality
ability of the existing
system to identify
processing similarities.

TRACKER

Tracker is a proprietary software package marketed by LAWTECH Inc. The software is written in UNIX which allows it to run on hardware supplied by a number of vendors including Sperry, NBI, NCR and PLEXUS. The system uses a relational data base management system called UNIFY.

The system was designed to operate in trial courts but the vendor reports that it can easily be modified to serve the needs of the Appellate Courts. The system is currently operating in one court in Grand Rapids, Michigan with an annual caseload of 10,000 cases. The court reports satisfaction with the system.

SYSTEM SUMMARY

CASE TRACKING SOFTWARE: A proprietary package called Tracker. The license fee is $40,000. Modifications to the
ISSUE INDEXING SOFTWARE:

Included with and integrated in the case tracking software.

HARDWARE:

The vendor reports that the system will operate on any hardware that supports UNIX and UNIFY (a relational data base manager). They provide a total hardware estimate of approximately $50,000 for a system that would accommodate up to 30 users. Their estimate includes 16 workstations and 6 printers.

ANALYSIS:

This package combines the case tracking and issue indexing into a single system. The fact that it uses UNIX would give the standard court package are estimated at $25,000.
V. CONCLUSION

This report has reviewed and verified the data processing requirements of the Clerk of Court and Chief Staff Attorney operators. We then reviewed a proposal received by the Chief Court Administrator's Office from Wang Computer Company and concluded that although the case tracking software that Wang proposed to transfer from the Rhode Island Appellate Court could meet Connecticut's requirements, we were concerned that the issue tracking software was not integrated with the case tracking software. We suggest that long term maintenance will be more complicated and potentially more expensive under this configuration. We also found that relative to other viable solutions the Wang hardware solution was more expensive. On the other hand, Wang proposed more workstations than other vendors. However, we did note that through the RFP process the Court will
be able to precisely define the desired system configuration and compare all vendors equally.

Finally, we identified three examples of alternative system configurations that could meet the needs of the Clerk and Staff Attorney.

We recommend that the Court Administrator schedule demonstrators of each of the systems described above. Based on user review of these systems we suggest that the Courts issue an RFP to obtain fixed price estimates from the vendors for a total system solution. For budgeting purposes we recommend that the Court Administrator assume that the total cost of system implementation including software, hardware, modifications and training will be approximately $150,000.

EMT would be pleased to work with the Court Administrator on any of the tasks associated with the identification and implementation of an automated system to assist in the reduction of court delay.

SUBJECT AREAS

AGENCY

ARBTRATION

BENEFIT ASSESSMENT

CONFLICTS (OF LAW)

CONSUMER PROTECTION
  Sales Contracts
  Usury
  Misc

CONTEMPT
  CR (Criminal)
  CV (Civil)

CONTRACTS
  Construction (Industry)
  Franchise
  Parol Evidence
  Misc

CORPORATIONS/PARTNERSHIPS
  *CRIMINAL (All criminal cases must be indexed to at least one of the categories below).
  ARR (Probable Cause to Arrest)
  Brady/Discovery
  Cross (Includes right to confrontation; limitation)

*NOTE: Annotations appear in ( ). Do not use this information in search command for a subject area. For Example, search command should be: Conflicts not Conflicts (of law).
Defenses (Index here and under Generic Issue "Defenses" if particular defense specifically identified under Generic Issues "Defenses", e.g., mental condition.)

DJ (Double Jeopardy)
EA Counsel (Effective Assistance of Counsel)
ID (Identification, Line-Up, & Show-Up)
LIO (Lesser Included Offense)
PCH (Probable Cause Hearing)
Prosecutorial Misconduct
Pleas
RT Counsel (Right to Counsel; will include some Miranda Claims)
Search & Seizure
Sentencing (includes probation)
STM (Statement; includes Self-Incarnation and some Miranda Claims)

Misc
CUTPA (Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act)
DISCRIMINATION
(Include HRO)
Dissolution
- Ali (Alimony)
- Custody
- Property (Property Assignment)
- Separation
- Support (Child Support)
- Misc

Education

Elections

Eminent Domain
- (Employment - use "Labor")

Environment

Extradition
- (Includes Detainer)

FOIA (Freedom of Information Act)

Foreclosure
- (Use "Receivers" if more related to that)

Forfeiture (Per § 54-33g only)

Fraud
- (Includes Fraudulent Conveyances)

Home Rule

Hospitals
- (Includes Administrative Appeals Re: Budgets)

Insurance
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FORM/CAUSE OF ACTION AND GENERIC ISSUES

ACTIONS, FORM/CAUSE OF:

Accounting
Administrative Appeal
Class Action
Declaratory Judgment
Habeas
Indemnification
Injunction
Mandamus
Summary Process
Third Party
Writ (Other than Habeas)
Wrongful Death

APPELLATE PROCEDURE & JURISDICTION:

(Aggrievement - See "Parties")
Mootness
Remand
Reservation
(Standing - See "Parties")
Tiers
Writ of Error
Misc

NOTE: Annotations appear in ( ). Do not use this information in search command of a generic issue. For example, search command under Attorneys should be: Conflict, not Conflict (of interest).
ATTORNEYS:

(Attorney-Client - Use "Evidence - Privilege")

Conflict (of Interest)
Disqualification
Fees
Pro Hac Vice
Misc

CON LAW (Civil and Criminal Cases):

Due Process
Equal Protection
First Amendment
Full Faith

* Conn A. S. - (Use this to index Connecticut Constitution, citing Article and Section. When searching, however, use "Conn")

Misc

DAMAGES:

Additir
Interest
Liquidated
Punitive
Remittitur
Treble (includes Double)
Misc
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EVIDENCE:

Burden of Proof
Cross (Civil Cases only; includes Rebuttal)
Experts
Hearsay
Impeachment
Judicial Notice
Presumptions (includes Inferences)
Prior Misconduct (by either defendant or witness; includes Other Crimes, Common Schemes)

Privilege
Relevancy
Standard of Proof

Sufficiency (Use for criminal cases where sufficiency of evidence is only issue; or civil is significant issue in case)

Witness Competency
Misc

FINAL JUDGMENT:

(Enter ruling from which appeal taken where final judgment question exists.)
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DEFENSES: (With the exception of the Misc category all criminal defenses listed below should also be referenced under subject area "Criminal Defenses").

Alibi

Immunity

Mental Condition (includes insanity, extreme emotional disturbance, etc)

Self-Defense

Statute of Frauds

Statute of Limitations

Misc (Civil cases only; index miscellaneous criminal defenses under "Criminal Defenses")

EQUITY AND EQUITABLE DEFENSES:

Estoppel

Laches

Misc