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## Petition to Proceed in forma pauperis:

e.g. Court A wants the Petition filed, without anything else accompanying it, make a ruling, then allow that filer to submit other documents.

e.g. Court B wants the Petition filed with other (case initiating) documents, then allow the filer to keep filing until a Ruling on the Petition is issued.

## Judge Action and Court Admin Action on certain documents:

Court A wants the filer to be able to select individual documents for action by the Judge (e.g. Motion) or by the court administrator (e.g. Motion to schedule a Hearing)

Court B wants the Clerk to route documents even prior to acceptance and/or full acceptance (the entire set of efiled docs)

## Fee Calculations

Court A allows filers to maintain draw-down accounts (e.g. to fund statutory filing fees and others), Court B does not. Court C charges a single fee per case initiated, Court D charges an initiation fee and another appearance fee at a later time.

## Document Sizes

Court A limits the number of pages, Court B limits the overall file size of each document, Court C limits the size of the overall submission.

## Document Types

Court A requires certain file format(s) for certain document types, Court B has a global list of allowable document types.

## Service

Court A will perform all the service functions, Court B only when paid to do so (Sheriff), Court C requires the filer to perform all service functions.

## Access to Docs

Court A allows case participants unlimited access to all case docs that are not sealed; Court B allows case participants access to only those docs that have been served upon them; Court C does not allow case participants access to any documents for certain case types.

## Sealing

Court A wants documents to be sealed filed separately. Court B wants them filed together with other documents, but with a request for the Court to seal (and not serve them yet). Court C allows documents to be efiled as “sealed”, Court D requires the filer to file the document to be filed as “sealed”

## Appearances

Court A allows anyone to file into an existing case. Court B requires a new filer to file an appearance first (as an fyi) and may charge a fee. Court C requires that a new appearance be confirmed by the Clerk first before that filer is allowed to file on the case.

## Reminders

Court A does not care about reminder being sent to parties, upon some period of time after a previous event such as the filing of a motion or answer. Court B does and wants the efiling system to a) convey the reminders produced by its case management system, or b) produce the reminders on its own, using a table of time allowances/requirements that the Court maintains.

## Acceptance

Court A never rejects but sends back “deficient”. Court B disallows rejection. Court C allows rejection but wants a separate email sent to the parties. AOC wants to set statewide acceptance/rejection parameters.

## Tech side aspects

11.1. **Development time policy** seems to be not efficient.  
It is typically replaced with the accepted document rulings at place.

11.2. **Runtime namespace** - the actual controls coming from the spec are basically within the code list that must follow the GeneriCode spec.  
Put it simple, on a GetPolicy call one may expect to get a different code list, not a strategy, nor a set of business rules to follow.

11.3. Courts, on the other hand, tend to interpret a Court Policy in a way as to modify the business rules on the fly (not a real-time, not at development time either).

Today's ECF Court Policy does not meet the need, nor that it offers an alternative.  
Possible directions to resolve the issue are in incorporating business rules.

provisions for script execution;  
provisions for business process description (probably in XML format);  
provisions for external code (reflecting the business rule) execution.