



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT


FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

COURT RULES ATTORNEY

222 West Seventh Avenue, Stop 4 (Room 272)

Anchorage, Alaska 99513-7564

e-mail: thomas_yerbich@akd.uscourts.gov



MEMORANDUM

Thomas J. Yerbich
Court Rules Attorney

(907) 677-6136

October 2, 2007

To: District Judges
Magistrate Judges
Law Clerks
Clerk of the Court
From: T.J. Yerbich

Re: Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure underwent substantial stylistic revisions effective December 1, 2007. The 2007 Revised Edition Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (West) received and distributed last month contains these revised rules.

As the restyled rules have a substantially "new look," it appears facially that the rule has been modified. In most instances this has not occurred; the changes were intended to have a stylistic not a substantive effect. Attached is a "quick reference" summary of the Advisory Committee comments to the 2007 amended and restyled rules indicating those rules where the change is intended to be stylistic only and where there are substantive changes. In some instances the restyled rules corrected ambiguities, eliminated redundancies, and inconsistencies. The Committee comment explains in some detail the reason those changes, although in some cases significant, are not intended to be substantive. Rules 4, 14, 16, 26, 30, 31, 36, 40, 70A (now 71.1), and 78, were substantively changed as well. These substantive changes are noted separately at the end of the comment applicable to each rule.

Also, the style change in a number of instances restructured the rule so that subsection designations and paragraph numbers differ from the "former" rule. Where references are made to the FED. R. CIV. P. in form documents, it may be necessary to revise the form to reference the correct subsection. For example, when a governmental official is sued in his/her official capacity and there is a change in the occupant of the office, the caption is changed to reflect the new official. This has usually been done using a footnote that references Rule 25 or 25(d)(1). Effective December 1, 2007, Rule 25(d)(2) is now Rule 17(d) and Rule 25 no longer has any numbered paragraphs. Thus, if the reference is to Rule 25(d)(1) it should be changed to Rule 25(d).

SUMMARY OF AMENDED/RESTYLED FED. R. CIV. P. EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1, 2007

Rule 1: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 2: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 3: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 4: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 4(d)(1)(C) corrects an inadvertent error in former Rule 4(d)(2)(G). The defendant needs two copies of the waiver form, not an extra copy of the notice and request.

Rule 4(g) changes “infant” to “minor.” “Infant” in the present rule means “minor.” Modern word usage suggests that “minor” will better maintain the intended meaning. The same change from “infant” to “minor” is made throughout the rules. In addition, subdivision (f)(3) is added to the description of methods of service that the court may order; the addition ensures the evident intent that the court not order service by means prohibited by international agreement.

Rule 4(i)(4) corrects a misleading reference to “the plaintiff” in former Rule 4(i)(3). A party other than a plaintiff may need a reasonable time to effect service. Rule 4(i)(4) properly covers any party.

Former Rule 4(j)(2) refers to service upon an “other governmental organization subject to suit.” This is changed to “any other state-created governmental organization that is subject to suit.” The change entrenches the meaning indicated by the caption (“Serving a Foreign, State, or Local Government”), and the invocation of state law. It excludes any risk that this rule might be read to govern service on a federal agency, or other entities not created by state law.

Substantive Change: The former provision describing service on interpleader claimants is deleted as redundant in light of the general provision in (k)(1)(C) recognizing personal jurisdiction authorized by a federal statute.

Rule 4.1: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 5: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 5(a)(1)(E) omits the former reference to a designation of record on appeal. Appellate Rule 10 is a self-contained provision for the record on appeal, and provides for service.

Former Rule 5(b)(2)(D) literally provided that a local rule may authorize use of the court’s transmission facilities to make service by non-electronic means agreed to by the parties. That was not intended. Rule 5(b)(3) restores the intended meaning — court transmission facilities can be used only for service by electronic means.

Rule 5(d)(2)(B) provides that “a” judge may accept a paper for filing, replacing the reference in former Rule 5(e) to “the” judge. Some courts do not assign a designated judge to each case, and it may be important to have another judge accept a paper for filing even when a case is on the individual docket of a particular judge. The ministerial acts of accepting the paper, noting the time, and transmitting the paper to the court clerk do not interfere with the assigned judge’s authority over the action.

Rule 5.1: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 5.2: **[New Privacy Rule]** [NOTE: This should not result in any significant change to local practice as we had adopted the comment draft as LR 5.2.1 (abrogated effective December 1, 2007). As noted below, there are differences between the comment draft and the final rule, but these do not change the effect or application of the rule.]

Changes After Publication

Subdivision (a) was amended to incorporate a suggestion from the Federal Magistrate Judges Association that the rule text state that the responsibility to redact filings rests on the filer, not the court clerk. [NOTE: We included this requirement in our local rule.]

As published, subdivision (b)(6) exempted from redaction all filings in habeas corpus proceedings under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241, 2254, or 2255. The exemption is revised to apply only to *pro se* filings. A petitioner represented by counsel, and respondents represented by counsel, must redact under Rule 5.2(a).

Subdivision (e) was published with a standard for protective orders, referring to a need to protect private or sensitive information not otherwise protected by Rule 5.2(a). This standard has been replaced by a general reference to "good cause."

Rule 6: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 7: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 7(a) stated that "there shall be * * * an answer to a cross-claim, if the answer contains a cross-claim * * *." Former Rule 12(a)(2) provided more generally that "[a] party served with a pleading stating a cross-claim against that party shall serve an answer thereto * * *." New Rule 7(a) corrects this inconsistency by providing for an answer to a crossclaim.

For the first time, Rule 7(a)(7) expressly authorizes the court to order a reply to a counterclaim answer. A reply may be as useful in this setting as a reply to an answer, a third-party answer, or a crossclaim answer.

Former Rule 7(b)(1) stated that the writing requirement is fulfilled if the motion is stated in a written notice of hearing. This statement was deleted as redundant because a single written document can satisfy the writing requirements both for a motion and for a Rule 6(c)(1) notice.

The cross-reference to Rule 11 in former Rule 7(b)(3) is deleted as redundant. Rule 11 applies by its own terms. The force and application of Rule 11 are not diminished by the deletion.

Former Rule 7(c) is deleted because it has done its work. If a motion or pleading is described as a demurrer, plea, or exception for insufficiency, the court will treat the paper as if properly captioned.

Rule 7.1: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 8: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The former Rule 8(b) and 8(e) cross-references to Rule 11 are deleted as redundant. Rule 11 applies by its own terms. The force and application of Rule 11 are not diminished by the deletion.

Former Rule 8(b) required a pleader denying part of an averment to “specify so much of it as is true and material and * * * deny only the remainder.” “[A]nd material” is deleted to avoid the implication that it is proper to deny something that the pleader believes to be true but not material.

Deletion of former Rule 8(e)(2)’s “whether based on legal, equitable, or maritime grounds” reflects the parallel deletions in Rule 1 and elsewhere. Merger is now successfully accomplished.

Rule 9: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 15 governs pleading amendments of its own force. The former redundant statement that Rule 15 governs an amendment that adds or withdraws a Rule 9(h) designation as an admiralty or maritime claim is deleted. The elimination of paragraph (2) means that “(3)” will be redesignated as “(2)” in Style Rule 9(h).

Rule 10: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Providing an e-mail address is useful, but does not of itself signify consent to filing or service by e-mail.

Rule 11: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 12: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 12(a)(4) referred to an order that postpones disposition of a motion “until the trial on the merits.” Rule 12(a)(4) now refers to postponing disposition “until trial.” The new expression avoids the ambiguity that inheres in “trial on the merits,” which may become confusing when there is a separate trial of a single issue or another event different from a single all-encompassing trial.

Rule 13: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The meaning of former Rule 13(b) is better expressed by deleting “not arising out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of the opposing party’s claim.” Both as a matter of intended meaning and current practice, a party may state as a permissive counterclaim a claim that does grow out of the same transaction or occurrence as an opposing party’s claim even though one of the exceptions in Rule 13(a) means the claim is not a compulsory counterclaim.

Rule 14: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 14 twice refers to counterclaims under Rule 13. In each case, the operation of Rule 13(a) depends on the state of the action at the time the pleading is filed. If plaintiff and third-party defendant have become opposing parties because one has made a claim for relief against the other, Rule 13(a) requires assertion of any counterclaim that grows out of the transaction or occurrence that is the subject matter of that claim. Rules 14(a)(2)(B) and (a)(3) reflect the distinction between compulsory and permissive counterclaims.

Substantive Change: A plaintiff should be on equal footing with the defendant in making third-party claims, whether the claim against the plaintiff is asserted as a counterclaim or as another form of claim. The limit imposed by the former reference to “counterclaim” is deleted.

Rule 15: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 15(c)(3)(A) called for notice of the “institution” of the action. Rule 15(c)(1)(C)(i) omits the reference to “institution” as potentially confusing. What counts is that the party to be brought in have notice of the existence of the action, whether or not the notice includes details as to its “institution.”

Rule 16: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Substantive Change: When a party or its representative is not present, it is enough to be reasonably available by any suitable means, whether telephone or other communication device.

Rule 17: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 17(d) incorporates the provisions of former Rule 25(d)(2), which fit better with Rule 17.

Rule 18: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Modification of the obscure former reference to a claim “heretofore cognizable only after another claim has been prosecuted to a conclusion” avoids any uncertainty whether Rule 18(b)’s meaning is fixed by retrospective inquiry from some particular date.

Rule 19: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 19(b) described the conclusion that an action should be dismissed for inability to join a Rule 19(a) party by carrying forward traditional terminology: “the absent person being thus regarded as indispensable.” “Indispensable” was used only to express a conclusion reached by applying the tests of Rule 19(b). It has been discarded as redundant.

Rule 20: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 21: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 22: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 23: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Amended Rule 23(d)(2) carries forward the provisions of former Rule 23(d) that recognize two separate propositions. First, a Rule 23(d) order may be combined with a pretrial order under Rule 16. Second, the standard for amending the Rule 23(d) order continues to be the more open-ended standard for amending Rule 23(d) orders, not the more exacting standard for amending Rule 16 orders.

As part of the general restyling, intensifiers that provide emphasis but add no meaning are consistently deleted. Amended Rule 23(f) omits as redundant the explicit reference to court of appeals discretion in deciding whether to permit an interlocutory appeal. The omission does not in any way limit the unfettered discretion established by the original rule.

Rule 23.1: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 23.2: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 24: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 25: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 25(d)(2) is transferred to become Rule 17(d) because it deals with designation of a public officer, not substitution.

Rule 26: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 26(a)(5) served only as an index of the discovery methods provided by later rules. It was deleted as redundant.

Former Rule 26(b)(1) began with a general statement of the scope of discovery that appeared to function as a preface to each of the five numbered paragraphs that followed. This preface has been shifted to the text of paragraph (1) because it does not accurately reflect the limits embodied in paragraphs (2), (3), or (4), and because paragraph (5) does not address the scope of discovery.

The reference to discovery of “books” in former Rule 26(b)(1) was deleted to achieve consistent expression throughout the discovery rules. Books remain a proper subject of discovery.

Amended Rule 26(b)(3) states that a party may obtain a copy of the party’s own previous statement “on request.” Former Rule 26(b)(3) expressly made the request procedure available to a nonparty witness, but did not describe the procedure to be used by a party. This apparent gap is closed by adopting the request procedure, which ensures that a party need not invoke Rule 34 to obtain a copy of the party’s own statement.

Rule 26(e) stated the duty to supplement or correct a disclosure or discovery response “to include information thereafter acquired.” This apparent limit is not reflected in practice; parties recognize the duty to supplement or correct by providing information that was not originally provided although it was available at the time of the initial disclosure or response. These words are deleted to reflect the actual meaning of the present rule.

Former Rule 26(e) used different phrases to describe the time to supplement or correct a disclosure or discovery response. Disclosures were to be supplemented “at appropriate intervals.” A prior discovery response must be “seasonably * * * amend[ed].” The fine distinction between these phrases has not been observed in practice. Amended Rule 26(e)(1)(A) uses the same phrase for disclosures and discovery responses. The party must supplement or correct “in a timely manner.”

Former Rule 26(g)(1) did not call for striking an unsigned disclosure. The omission was an obvious drafting oversight. Amended Rule 26(g)(2) includes disclosures in the list of matters that the court must strike unless a signature is provided “promptly * * * after being called to the attorney’s or party’s attention.”

Former Rule 26(b)(2)(A) referred to a “good faith” argument to extend existing law. Amended Rule 26(b)(1)(B)(i) changes this reference to a “nonfrivolous” argument to achieve consistency with Rule 11(b)(2).

Substantive Change: As with the Rule 11 signature on a pleading, written motion, or other paper, disclosure and discovery signatures should include not only a postal address but also a telephone number and electronic-mail address. A signer who lacks one or more of those addresses need not supply a nonexistent item.

Rule 11(b)(2) recognizes that it is legitimate to argue for establishing new law. An argument to establish new law is equally legitimate in conducting discovery.

Rule 27: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 28: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 29: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 30: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Substantive Change: The right to arrange a deposition transcription should be open to any party, regardless of the means of recording and regardless of who noticed the deposition.

“[O]ther entity” is added to the list of organizations that may be named as deponent. The purpose is to ensure that the deposition process can be used to reach information known or reasonably available to an organization no matter what abstract fictive concept is used to describe the organization. Nothing is gained by wrangling over the place to fit into current rule language such entities as limited liability companies, limited partnerships, business trusts, more exotic common-law creations, or forms developed in other countries.

Rule 31: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Substantive Change: The party who noticed a deposition on written questions must notify all other parties when the deposition is completed, so that they may make use of the deposition.

Rule 32: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 32(a) applied “[a]t the trial or upon the hearing of a motion or an interlocutory proceeding.” The amended rule describes the same events as “a hearing or trial.”

The final paragraph of former Rule 32(a) allowed use in a later action of a deposition “lawfully taken and duly filed in the former action.” Because of the 2000 amendment of Rule 5(d), many depositions are not filed. Amended Rule 32(a)(8) reflects this change by excluding use of an unfiled deposition only if filing was required in the former action.

Rule 33: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The final sentence of former Rule 33(a) was a redundant cross-reference to the discovery moratorium provisions of Rule 26(d). Rule 26(d) is now familiar, obviating any need to carry forward the redundant cross-reference.

Former Rule 33(b)(5) was a redundant reminder of Rule 37(a) procedure that is omitted as no longer useful.

Former Rule 33(c) stated that an interrogatory “is not necessarily objectionable merely because an answer * * * involves an opinion or contention * * *.” “[I]s not necessarily” seemed to imply that the interrogatory might be objectionable merely for this reason. This implication has been ignored in practice. Opinion and contention interrogatories are used routinely. Amended Rule 33(a)(2) embodies the current meaning of Rule 33 by omitting “necessarily.”

Rule 34: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The final sentence in the first paragraph of former Rule 34(b) was a redundant cross-reference to the discovery moratorium provisions of Rule 26(d). Rule 26(d) is now familiar, obviating any need to carry forward the redundant cross-reference.

The redundant reminder of Rule 37(a) procedure in the second paragraph of former Rule 34(b) is omitted as no longer useful.

Rule 35: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 36: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The final sentence of the first paragraph of former Rule 36(a) was a redundant cross-reference to the discovery moratorium provisions of Rule 26(d). Rule 26(d) is now familiar, obviating any need to carry forward the redundant cross-reference. The redundant reminder of Rule 37(c) in the second paragraph was likewise omitted.

Substantive Change: An admission that has been incorporated in a pretrial order can be withdrawn or amended only under Rule 16(d) or (e). The standard of Rule 36(b) applies to other Rule 36 admissions.

Rule 37: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 38: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 39: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 40: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Substantive Changes: The best methods for scheduling trials depend on local conditions. It is useful to ensure that each district adopts an explicit rule for scheduling trials. It is not useful to limit or dictate the provisions of local rules.

Rule 41: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

When Rule 23 was amended in 1966, Rules 23.1 and 23.2 were separated from Rule 23. Rule 41(a)(1) was not then amended to reflect the Rule 23 changes. In 1968 Rule 41(a)(1) was amended to correct the cross-reference to what had become Rule 23(e), but Rules 23.1 and 23.2 were inadvertently overlooked. Rules 23.1 and 23.2 are now added to the list of exceptions in Rule 41(a)(1)(A). This change does not affect established meaning. Rule 23.2 explicitly incorporates Rule 23(e), and thus was already absorbed directly into the exceptions in Rule 41(a)(1). Rule 23.1 requires court approval of a compromise or dismissal in language parallel to Rule 23(e) and thus supersedes the apparent right to dismiss by notice of dismissal.

Rule 42: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 43: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 44: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 44.1: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 45: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The reference to discovery of “books” in former Rule 45(a)(1)(C) was deleted to achieve consistent expression throughout the discovery rules. Books remain a proper subject of discovery.

Former Rule 45(b)(1) required “prior notice” to each party of any commanded production of documents and things or inspection of premises. Courts have agreed that notice must be given “prior” to the return date, and have tended to converge on an interpretation that requires notice to the parties before the subpoena is served on the person commanded to produce or permit inspection. That interpretation is adopted in amended Rule 45(b)(1) to give clear notice of general present practice.

The language of former Rule 45(d)(2) addressing the manner of asserting privilege is replaced by adopting the wording of Rule 26(b)(5). The same meaning is better expressed in the same words.

- Rule 46: Changes intended to be stylistic only.
- Rule 47: Changes intended to be stylistic only.
- Rule 48: Changes intended to be stylistic only.
- Rule 49: Changes intended to be stylistic only.
- Rule 50: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 50(b) stated that the court reserves ruling on a motion for judgment as a matter of law made at the close of all the evidence “[i]f, for any reason, the court does not grant” the motion. The words “for any reason” reflected the proposition that the reservation is automatic and inescapable. The ruling is reserved even if the court explicitly denies the motion. The same result follows under the amended rule. If the motion is not granted, the ruling is reserved.

Amended Rule 50(e) identifies the appellate court’s authority to direct the entry of judgment. This authority was not described in former Rule 50(d), but was recognized in *Weisgram v. Marley Co.*, 528 U.S. 440 (2000), and in *Neely v. Martin K. Eby Construction Company*, 386 U.S. 317 (1967). When Rule 50(d) was drafted in 1963, the Committee Note stated that “[s]ubdivision (d) does not attempt a regulation of all aspects of the procedure where the motion for judgment n.o.v. and any accompanying motion for a new trial are denied * * *.” Express recognition of the authority to direct entry of judgment does not otherwise supersede this caution.

- Rule 51: Changes intended to be stylistic only.
- Rule 52: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 52(a) said that findings are unnecessary on decisions of motions “except as provided in subdivision (c) of this rule.” Amended Rule 52(a)(3) says that findings are unnecessary “unless these rules provide otherwise.” This change reflects provisions in other rules that require Rule 52 findings on deciding motions. Rules 23(e), 23(h), and 54(d)(2)(C) are examples.

Amended Rule 52(a)(5) includes provisions that appeared in former Rule 52(a) and 52(b). Rule 52(a) provided that requests for findings are not necessary for purposes of review. It applied both in an action tried on the facts without a jury and also in granting or refusing an interlocutory injunction. Rule 52(b), applicable to findings “made in actions tried without a jury,” provided that the sufficiency of the evidence

might be “later questioned whether or not in the district court the party raising the question objected to the findings, moved to amend them, or moved for partial findings.” Former Rule 52(b) did not explicitly apply to decisions granting or refusing an interlocutory injunction. Rule 52(a)(5) makes explicit the application of this part of former Rule 52(b) to interlocutory injunction decisions.

Former Rule 52(c) provided for judgment on partial findings, and referred to it as “judgment as a matter of law.” Amended Rule 52(c) refers only to “judgment,” to avoid any confusion with a Rule 50 judgment as a matter of law in a jury case. The standards that govern judgment as a matter of law in a jury case have no bearing on a decision under Rule 52(c).

Rule 53: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 54: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 54(b) required two steps to enter final judgment as to fewer than all claims among all parties. The court must make an express determination that there is no just reason for delay and also make an express direction for the entry of judgment. Amended Rule 54(b) eliminates the express direction for the entry of judgment. There is no need for an “express direction” when the court expressly determines that there is no just reason for delay and enters a final judgment.

The words “or class member” have been removed from Rule 54(d)(2)(C) because Rule 23(h)(2) now addresses objections by class members to attorney-fee motions. Rule 54(d)(2)(C) is amended to recognize that Rule 23(h) now controls those aspects of attorney-fee motions in class actions to which it is addressed.

Rule 55: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 55(a) directed the clerk to enter a default when a party failed to plead or otherwise defend “as provided by these rules.” The implication from the reference to defending “as provided by these rules” seemed to be that the clerk should enter a default even if a party did something showing an intent to defend, but that act was not specifically described by the rules. Courts in fact have rejected that implication. Acts that show an intent to defend have frequently prevented a default even though not connected to any particular rule. “[A]s provided by these rules” is deleted to reflect Rule 55(a)’s actual meaning.

Amended Rule 55 omits former Rule 55(d), which included two provisions. The first recognized that Rule 55 applies to described claimants. The list was incomplete and unnecessary. Rule 55(a) applies Rule 55 to any party against whom a judgment for affirmative relief is requested. The second provision was a redundant reminder that Rule 54(c) limits the relief available by default judgment.

Rule 56: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 56(a) and (b) referred to summary-judgment motions on or against a claim, counterclaim, or crossclaim, or to obtain a declaratory judgment. The list was incomplete. Rule 56 applies to third-party claimants, intervenors, claimants in interpleader, and others. Amended Rule 56(a) and (b) carry forward the present meaning by referring to a party claiming relief and a party against whom relief is sought.

Former Rule 56(c), (d), and (e) stated circumstances in which summary judgment “shall be rendered,” the court “shall if practicable” ascertain facts existing without substantial controversy, and “if appropriate, shall” enter summary judgment. In each place “shall” is changed to “should.” It is established that although there is no discretion to enter summary judgment when there is a genuine issue as to any material fact, there is discretion to deny summary judgment when it appears that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact. *Kennedy v. Silas Mason Co.*, 334 U.S. 249, 256-257 (1948). Many lower court decisions are gathered in 10A Wright, Miller & Kane, Federal Practice & Procedure: Civil 3d, § 2728. “Should” in amended Rule 56(c) recognizes that courts will seldom exercise the discretion to deny summary judgment when there is no genuine issue as to any material fact. Similarly sparing exercise of this discretion is appropriate under Rule 56(e)(2). Rule 56(d)(1), on the other hand, reflects the more open-ended discretion to decide whether it is practicable to determine what material facts are not genuinely at issue.

Former Rule 56(d) used a variety of different phrases to express the Rule 56(c) standard for summary judgment — that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact. Amended Rule 56(d) adopts terms directly parallel to Rule 56(c).

Rule 57: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 58: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 59: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 60: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The final sentence of former Rule 60(b) said that the procedure for obtaining any relief from a judgment was by motion as prescribed in the Civil Rules or by an independent action. That provision is deleted as unnecessary. Relief continues to be available only as provided in the Civil Rules or by independent action.

Rule 61: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 62: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The final sentence of former Rule 62(a) referred to Rule 62(c). It is deleted as an unnecessary. Rule 62(c) governs of its own force.

Rule 63: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 64: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 64 stated that the Civil Rules govern an action in which any remedy available under Rule 64(a) is used. The Rules were said to govern from the time the action is commenced if filed in federal court, and from the time of removal if removed from state court. These provisions are deleted as redundant. Rule 1 establishes that the Civil Rules apply to all actions in a district court, and Rule 81(c)(1) adds reassurance that the Civil Rules apply to a removed action “after it is removed.”

Rule 65: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The final sentence of former Rule 65(c) referred to Rule 65.1. It is deleted as unnecessary. Rule 65.1 governs of its own force.

Rule 65(d)(2) clarifies two ambiguities in former Rule 65(d). The former rule was adapted from former 28 U.S.C. § 363, but omitted a comma that made clear the common doctrine that a party must have actual notice of an injunction in order to be bound by it. Amended Rule 65(d) restores the meaning of the earlier statute, and also makes clear the proposition that an injunction can be enforced against a person who acts in concert with a party's officer, agent, servant, employee, or attorney.

Rule 65.1: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 66: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 67: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 68: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 69: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Amended Rule 69(b) incorporates directly the provisions of 2 U.S.C. § 118 and 28 U.S.C. § 2006, deleting the incomplete statement in former Rule 69(b) of the circumstances in which execution does not issue against an officer.

Rule 70: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 71: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 71.1: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Former Rule 71A has been redesignated as Rule 71.1 to conform to the designations used for all other rules added within the original numbering system.

Substantive Change: Rule 71.1(e) allows a defendant to appear without answering. Former form 28 (now form 60) includes information about this right in the Rule 71.1(d)(2) notice. It is useful to confirm this practice in the rule.

Rule 72: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 73: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 74: [Abrogated in 1997. Number reserved for future use.]

Rule 75: [Abrogated in 1997. Number reserved for future use.]

Rule 76: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 77: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 78: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Substantive Change: Rule 16 has superseded any need for the provision in former Rule 78 for orders for the advancement, conduct, and hearing of actions.

Rule 79: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 80: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 81: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 81(c) has been revised to reflect the amendment of 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a) that changed the procedure for removal from a petition for removal to a notice of removal.

Former Rule 81(e), drafted before the decision in *Erie R.R. v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64 (1938), defined state law to include "the statutes of that state and the state judicial decisions construing them." The *Erie* decision reinterpreted the Rules of Decision Act, now 28 U.S.C. § 1652, recognizing that the "laws" of the states include the common law established by judicial decisions. Long-established practice reflects this understanding, looking to state common law as well as statutes and court rules when a Civil Rule directs use of state law. Amended Rule 81 (d)(1) adheres to this practice, including all state judicial decisions, not only those that construe state statutes.

Former Rule 81(f) is deleted. The office of district director of internal revenue was abolished by restructuring under the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform. Act of 1998, Pub.L. 105-206, July 22, 1998, 26 U.S.C. § 1 Note.

Rule 82: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 83: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 84: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 85: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 86: Changes intended to be stylistic only.

The subdivisions that provided a list of the effective dates of the original Civil Rules and amendments made up to 1963 are deleted as no longer useful.

Rule 86(b) is added to clarify the relationship of amendments taking effect on December 1, 2007, to other laws for the purpose of applying the "supersession" clause in 28 U.S.C. § 2072(b). Section 2072(b) provides that a law in conflict with an Enabling Act Rule "shall be of no further force or effect after such rule[] ha[s] taken effect." The amendments that take effect on December 1, 2007, result from the general restyling of the Civil Rules and from a small number of technical revisions adopted on a parallel track. None of these amendments is intended to affect resolution of any conflict that might arise between a rule and another law. Rule 86(b) makes this intent explicit. Any conflict that arises should be resolved by looking to the date the specific conflicting rule provision first became effective.