

**E-Filing Task Force**  
**Technical Recommendations, Questions and Suggestions**

ADM File No. 2002-37

2E.001 – Clarification about the interplay between the “traditional” court rules and the electronic ones might be desirable.

2E.002(A) – Amici and guardian ad litem should be included as authorized users in order to allow them to file electronically.

2E.002(F) – Consider a provision addressing the printing of documents for a fee.

2E.003(B)(1) and (4) – There is a concern that these sub-rules might present problems for trial court clerks if two separate, partial files are necessitated – one with electronically permissible documents and the other with those not permitted to be in electronic format.

2E.004(A) – Consider specifying controls on the vendors’ use of registration information.

2E.004(B) – Consider appeal process when a user’s access is revoked.

2E.004(C) – Notification process should be uniform and expressly stated in the rule.

2E.006 – Signature format should be uniform and expressly stated in the rule.

2E.007 – Clarify whether the maintenance, inspection and copying is to be in paper or electronic format.

2E.008 – Query whether “transmission failure” could be a safe haven for abusers.

2E.101(A) – This provision may conflict with 2E.202, which gives a specific deadline for filing. U.S. District Court employees note that the federal court uses a midnight deadline, which has not been problematic.

2E.105 – It is unclear where the terminal is to be located, how many are to be available, and whether the clerk’s office must provide assistance.

2E.201 – It is unclear how e-service is treated for purposes of MCR 2.119(C)(1), as personal service, service by mail, or some other option.

2E.202 – There should be a standardized certificate or proof of service in a manner similar to the federal system.

2007-12

Amend title to make it consistent with 2E.202, and correct comment.