**LegalXML ECF 5 Civil Complaint Examples**

As of Working Draft 34 – Use case series revision 02

This document provides use case descriptions and other supplemental information for a set of example ECF-5 xml exchanges. This use case collection is based on Barbara Holmes Use case #300 – Case Initiation Civil Complaint, alternative 1 (self-represented plaintiff). These examples are consistent with working draft 34 (wd34).

**General Description:**

This example set contains 23 individual XML instance documents that together comprise a round-trip ‘plus’ (+) use case example for a simple civil complaint case initiation filing.

XML Instance Examples:

1. Civil-complaint-000-FilingMessage-02.xml
2. Civil-complaint-001-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml
3. Civil-complaint-002-ReviewFilingResponse-02.xml
4. Civil-complaint-003-GetFilingStatusRequest-02.xml
5. Civil-complaint-004-GetFilingStatusResponse-02-xml
6. Civil-complaint-005-RecordDocketingRequest-02.xml
7. Civil-complaint-006-RecordDocketingResponse-02.xml
8. Civil-complaint-007-NotifyDocketingCompleteRequest-02.xml
9. Civil-complaint-008-NotifyDocketingCompleteResponse-02.xml
10. Civil-complaint-009-NotifyFilingReviewCompleteRequest-02.xml
11. Civil-complaint-010-NotifyFilingReviewCompleteResponse-02.xml
12. Civil-complaint-011-GetCaseRequest-02.xml
13. Civil-complaint-012-GetCaseResponse-02.xml
14. Civil-complaint-013-GetFilingListRequest-02.xml
15. Civil-complaint-014-GetFilingListResponse-02.xml
16. Civil-complaint-015-GetDocumentRequest-02.xml
17. Civil-complaint-016-GetDocumentRequest-02.xml
18. Civil-complaint-017-GetDocumentResponse-01.xml
19. Civil-complaint-018-GetDocumentResponse-02.xml
20. Civil-complaint-019-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml
21. Civil-complaint-020-ReviewFilingResponse-02.xml
22. Civil-complaint-021-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml
23. Civil-complaint-022-ReviewFilingResponse-02.xml

All XML instance examples are annotated using XML comments. Some annotations simply provide additional clarifying information. Other annotations raise considerations or seek answers to questions. Key questions or issues are repeated in this document within a table for each message, where applicable.

The ECF TC members are encouraged to carefully review these use case examples and to review the considerations raised. Additional review/work sessions may be appropriate to review and address these questions and considerations.

**Descriptions of Examples:**

The example XML instances comprise a full set of all the exchanges that may typically occur from the case initiation filing, by the plaintiff, of a civil complaint, with an attached exhibit document, and a defendant summons. This includes the case initiation submittal, clerk review, status querying, docketing and subsequent callback messages.

Once the initial filing life-cycle has concluded, then this use case continues with multiple ‘get’ requests (i.e. GetCaseRequest, GetFilingListRequest, and GetDocumentRequest) to obtain various information and document content resulting from the initial complaint filing.

Finally, this use case includes two additional ReviewFilingRequest submittals which represent typical subsequent case filing activities which are responsive to the initial complaint filing. These are: (1) filing of the proof of service of the summons, and (2) filing of the answer to the complaint. The full round-trip XML instances for these two additional submittals are not included in this use case collection.

This use case does not include all possible ECF 5 exchanges. For example, GetPolicy, ServeFiling, GetFeesCalculation, and DocumentStampInformation are not included. Future additional use cases should include these exchanges.

Additionally, this use case does not address all possible variations that could occur even within the limited scope of a civil complaint filing. For example, case information modifications made in clerk review are not included. Multi-episode clerk review is not included. Lead documents with multiple connected documents have not been included. Alternative language document renditions have not been included. Pro Hac Vice attorneys have not been included. Errant conditions and rejections are not included, etc. Additional use case examples should be created for these and other variations.

**Civil-complaint-000-FilingMessage-02.xml**

This example is a basic filing message and may not be used as is in any exchange, since the contents of the FilingMessage will vary in different exchanges. This message was created by modifying the civil.xml example from the examples folder. Since this example FilingMessage contains the filing identifier assigned by the Filing Review MDE (e.g. the EFM filing identifier), this example would not occur prior to the record docketing request.

**Civil-complaint-001-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml**

In this example filing:FilingMessage a single self-represented plaintiff person (i.e. John W. Doe) submits a complaint for filing with the Civil Court. The complaint has an attached (e.g. connected) exhibit document. The filing is a case initiation submittal. A summons for the defendant is also provided in the submission.

**Civil-complaint-002-ReviewFilingResponse-02.xml**

This example message is synchronously returned to the FAMDE by the FRMDE upon receipt of civil-complaint-001-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml. This response message returns the filing identifier assigned by the Filing Review MDE to the Filing Assembly MDE.

**Civil-complaint-003-GetFilingStatusRequest-02.xml**

In this use case scenario, the original e-filing submitter wants to know what is going on with his submission and submits a GetFilingStatusRequest. Unbeknownst to the submitter, the submission is sitting in a clerk review queue awaiting clerk review.

The filing is referenced using the Filing Identifier assigned by the Filing Review MDE and returned to the FAMDE on the ReviewFilingResponse.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 36 | GetFilingStatusRequestMessage | Separation of message metadata from request query parameters is recommended. |
| 74 | ecf:DocumentFiler | Confirm that nc:DocumentSubmitter should be used to identify the submitter of the request, and also confirm that ecf:DocumentFiler, if present, is a request parameter. |

**Civil-complaint-004-GetFilingStatusResponse-02.xml**

This message is the response to the previous GetFilingStatusRequest.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 68 | ecf:MatchingFiling | Review message design, currently provides the structure for a document and not a filing. A filing can consist of multiple documents. FilingMessage is the correct structure for a filing, and as such, it may also be the correct structure for MatchingFiling. Also see Civil-complaint-014-GetFilingListResponse-02.xml.Cardinality currently only allows for one ecf:MatchingFiling element within a GetFilingStatusResponse. If the filing contained multiple documents, then multiple GetFilingStatusResponses are required. If the structure of MatchingFiling is corrected to actually accommodate a filing and not a document, then perhaps the current cardinality is sufficient. |
| 137 | ecf:FilingStatusCode | Limited status choices are provided in FilingStatusCode.gc (i.e. accepted, cancelled, partially-accepted, received, rejected, issued) Also see Civil-Complaint-019-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml below.Note that the status code used in the filingstatusresponse.xml example from the examples folder is ‘submitted’ which is not contained with FilingStatusCode.gc. |

**Civil-Complaint-005-RecordDocketingRequest-02.xml**

This 'exchange' occurs at the conclusion of clerk review. Consistent with a minimalist example, this is a single episode clerk review (e.g. all submitted documents were reviewed and dispositioned in a single clerk review episode, thus resulting in a single 'exchange' (i.e. a single RecordDocketingRequest).

The complaint and exhibit documents are accepted by the reviewing clerk in the clerk review function.

The clerk review system assigns its own unique case tracking ID which is independent from any case tracking ID assigned by the court in the Court Record MDE (e.g. case management system).

Upon acceptance of the complaint document in clerk review, a new file stamped rendition is generated. Both the original rendition and the file stamped rendition are provided to the Court Record MDE. To keep this use case as simple as possible, the new ECF5 DocumentStampInformation request is not included to obtain the case number prior to document stamping (this should be included in future additional use cases).

The exhibit is not file stamped and therefore there is no new rendition introduced within clerk review.

The summons is 'issued' (not 'accepted') by the clerk in clerk review. When 'issued' a new 'issued stamped' rendition of the summons is added and provided to the Court Record MDE. The Court Record MDE will return the 'issued stamped' summons to the FAMDE in the NotifyDocketingCompleteRequest. The Court Record MDE will not file/docket the summons.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 83 | nc:DocumentSubmitter | It is not possible to identify both the original e-filing submitter and the submitting clerk reviewer in a single instance of this element. |
| 88 | ecf:DocumentFiler | Is it necessary to repeat the original document filer information if there has not been any change in clerk review?Although repetition does not appear to be required by specification, this seems to be a practical necessity. |
| 148 | ecf:CorrectedCase | Is it appropriate or required to use this element when a new CaseTrackingID is added in clerk review?Refer to 6.4.3 – “if the clerk made any modification to the original filing information . . .” If new CaseTrackingID is added into CorrectedCase, must all original case information be replicated? |
| 176 | j:CaseAugmentation | Needs to have xsi:nil attribute. |
| 178 | ecf:CaseAugmentation | Needs to have xsi:nil attribute. |
| 198 | civil:CaseAugmentation | Needs to have xsi:nil attribute. |

**Civil-complaint-006-RecordDocketingResponse-02.xml**

This example message is synchronously returned to the FRMDE by the CRMDE upon receipt of civil-complaint-005-RecordDocketingRequest-02.xml.

**Civil-Complaint-007-NotifyDocketingCompleteRequest-02.xml**

This exchange results from the conclusion of 'docketing' by the Court Record MDE.

The Filing Identifier assigned by the FRMDE upon receipt of the ReviewFilingRequest is returned.

The court’s case number and a CMS case tracking ID are assigned in this operation.

Those documents, filed in the court and archived within the Court Record MDE's electronic document management system, are assigned CRMDE unique document rendition identifiers. These identifiers are communicated in this message.

The summons document renditions are not docketed or filed in the court. The 'issued stamped' summons rendition is returned to the original filer through this message (e.g. Payload3).

The Complaint and its connected exhibit document are docketed as a single event in the Court Record MDE. The file stamped rendition of the complaint and the original exhibit are returned.

Document hashes are provided for all renditions returned.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 101 | ecf:DocumentFiler | Is it necessary, or even recommended, to return the original e-filing submission filer in this element? |
| 148 | ecf:FilingStatusCode | Does this covey docketing status or clerk review status? |
| 221 | ecf:RegisterActionDescriptionCode | The purpose and meaning of this element changes upon docketing. Prior to docketing it contains a document type code. After docketing it contains a docket code. These may be different codes. When the document type code is not the same as the docket code, then the original usage (i.e. as a document type) is overwritten. |

**Civil-complaint-008-NotifyDocketingCompleteResponse-02.xml**

This example message is synchronously returned to the CRMDE by the FRMDE upon receipt of civil-complaint-005-RecordDocketingRequest-02.xml.

**Civil-Complaint-009-NotifyFilingReviewCompleteRequest-02.xml**

This 'exchange' occurs upon receipt, by the Filing Review MDE, of the NotifyDocketingCompleteRequest from the Court Record MDE.

**Civil-complaint-010-NotifyFilingReviewCompleteResponse-02.xml**

This example message is synchronously returned to the CRMDE by the FRMDE upon receipt of civil-complaint-009-NotifyFilingReviewCompleteRequest-02.xml.

**Civil-complaint-011-GetCaseRequest-02.xml**

This example illustrates a Get Case Request following the creation of a new civil case as a result of civil complaint filing submitted in civil-complaint-001-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 70 | ecf:CourtEventTypeCode | Why is this element mandatory? Modify to be optional. |
|  |  |  |

**Civil-complaint-012-GetCaseResponse-02.xml**

This 'exchange' is in response to a GetCaseRequest (i.e. civil-complaint-011-GetCaseRequest-02.xml).

The Get Case Request indicated that participant and docket information should be returned in the response. Calendar information was not selected.

The docket information includes external references to the docket event associated documents (i.e. the complaint and exhibit).

Participant information includes local Court Record MDE identifiers for participants (e.g. Participant Matching).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 157 | ecf:ConnectedDocument | ‘Child’ (e.g. connected documents) must be both an ecf:ConnectedDocument and associated with its parent lead ecf:ConnectedDocument using nc:DocumentAssociation.The ‘quirk’ is that DocumentRelatedCode.gc contains ‘parent’ but not ‘child’ so the parent to child document association can only be done in one direction.  |
|  |  |  |

**Civil-complaint-013-GetFilingListRequest-02.xml**

A request to get a list of documents filed in case CV-2017-010110 in 'Civil Court' (10).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 33 | nc:DocumentIdentification | If a specific filing is being requested, can the requester use the Filing Identifier assigned by the FRMDE as a query parameter using the nc:DocumentIdentification element? |
| 101 | nc:DocumentSubmitter | What is the purpose for this element? Is it a query parameter? |

**Civil-complaint-014-GetFilingListResponse-02.xml**

A response for a request to get filings for case CV-2017-010110 in 'Civil Court' (10).

This example illustrates a court implementation where only information about documents and document renditions are returned in the response; i.e. the full document binary content is not returned in this example (see filinglistresponse.xml for an example which includes returned binary content). For this example, the requester must make separate GetDocumentRequests to get binary content for one or more filings returned in this response (see civil-complaint-015-GetDocumentRequest-02.xml).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 91, 175 | ecf:MatchingFiling | This Get Filing Response returns a single filing, but includes two documents: (1) complaint, and (2) exhibit (connected). Unfortunately, even though there is only a single filing, two ecf:MatchingFiling elements must be used to return both documents in this single filing. This makes it appear as though there are two filings not one. Keep in mind that these two documents were submitted to the court and filed as a single filing. Also see Civil-complaint-004-GetFilingStatusResponse-02.xml above.The ecf:MatchingFiling element should be redesigned to reflect a filing and not a document (also see Civil-complaint-004-GetFilingStatusResponse-02.xml). |

**Civil-complaint-015-GetDocumentRequest-02.xml**

The requester wants to get/view the complaint and its attached/child exhibit document renditions filed in case CV-2017-010110 in 'Civil Court' (10). However, since only a single document and/or document rendition can be requested in a single GetDocumentRequest, two requests must be made to get the complaint and its attached exhibit. This first request is for the file stamped rendition of the complaint.

The requester has requested both the complaint and the exhibit.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 21 | wrapper:GetDocumentRequest | Consider redesign that permits the request of a single lead and all its connected documents in a single request. |
| 109 | nc:DocumentFileControlID | Confirm that this element is used to specify the document identifier value (assigned by the CRMDE) when requesting a specific document and rendition.  |

**Civil-complaint-016-GetDocumentRequest-02.xml**

This is the second request in a pair of GetDocumentRequests to get both the file stamped rendition of the complaint and its attached exhibit. This request is for the exhibit document in case CV-2017-010110 in 'Civil Court' (10).

**Civil-complaint-017-GetDocumentResponse-02.xml**

A response for a request to get/view the file stamped Complaint document rendition filed in case CV-2017-010110 in 'Civil Court' (10).

The Document Request (i.e. civil-complaint-015-GetDocumentRequest-02.xml) was a request for the file stamped rendition of the complaint.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 21 | wrapper:GetDocumentResponse | Consider a redesign that permits a lead document and all its connected documents to be returned in a single response. |

**Civil-complaint-018-GetDocumentResponse-02.xml**

A response for a request to get/view the exhibit document rendition filed in case CV-2017-010110 in 'Civil Court' (10).

The Document Request (i.e. civil-complaint-016-GetDocumentRequest-02.xml) was a request for the exhibit document. The exhibit is a child document of the complaint document (returned in civil-complaint-017-GetDocumentResponse-02.xml). This relationship is described using the nc:DocumentAssociation element. The parent document (i.e. the complaint) is referenced using an external document reference identifier. Specifically, the document association uses the Court Record assigned value as an external reference to the complaint.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 165 | nc:DocumentAssociation | Review the use of nc:DocumentAssociation as a means for relating the exhibit document to its parent complaint document using an external reference. |
| 173 | nc:IdentificationCategoryDescriptionText | Consider interoperability issues with use of ‘DocumentRenditionFileControlID’ – a non-specification endorsed value. |

**Civil-Complaint-019-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml**

In this example the process server, Bill K. Racquet, files the proof of service document for service of the summons on defendant Jane Q. Smith.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Line** | **Element** | **Issue** |
| 184 | nc:StatusText | Is ‘accepted’ the correct choice to use in this context (i.e. filing a proof of service of a summons), or should a new choice be defined, such as ‘served’. |
|  |  |  |

**Civil-complaint-020-ReviewFilingResponse-02.xml**

This example message is synchronously returned to the FAMDE by the FRMDE upon receipt of civil-complaint-019-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml.

Response to Proof of Service ReviewFilingRequest.

**Civil-Complaint-021-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml**

In this example, the defendant Jane Q. Smith's attorney, Ralph K. Williams, files an answer to the complaint.

**Civil-complaint-022-ReviewFilingResponse-01.xml**

Response to Answer ReviewFilingRequest.

This example message is synchronously returned to the FAMDE by the FRMDE upon receipt of civil-complaint-021-ReviewFilingRequest-02.xml.

**Anticipated Revisions:**

This section identifies planned or approved specification modifications that will or may need to be incorporated into one or more of the use case messages in a future work draft version:

1. If the xsi:nil attribute is added to various complex elements (e.g. j:CaseAugmentation, ecf:DocumentAugmentation, civil:CaseAugmentation, ecf:DocumentRendition, etc.) then some messages (e.g. civil-complaint-005-RecordDocketingRequest-02.xml) will need revision.
2. If all messages, including response messages MUST have their own unique message identifier, then these will need to be added to many response messages.