THE COURTS

Title 231—RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

PART I. GENERAL [231 PA. CODE CH. 4000]

Proposed New Rule 4003.8 Governing Pre-Complaint Discovery; Proposed Recommendation No. 221

The Civil Procedural Rules Committee is proposing that new Rule of Civil Procedure 4003.8 governing precomplaint discovery be promulgated as set forth in the following recommendation. The recommendation is being submitted to the bench and bar for comments and suggestions prior to its submission to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

All communications in reference to the proposed recommendation should be sent not later than February 16, 2007 to:

Harold K. Don, Jr., Counsel Civil Procedural Rules Committee 5035 Ritter Road, Suite 700 Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania 17055

or E-Mail to civil.rules@pacourts.us

The Explanatory Comment which appears in connection with the proposed recommendation has been inserted by the Committee for the convenience of the bench and bar. It will not constitute part of the rules of civil procedure or be officially adopted or promulgated by the Court.

Annex A

TITLE 231. RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE PART I. GENERAL

CHAPTER 4000. DEPOSITIONS AND DISCOVERY Rule 4001. Scope. Definitions.

(c) Subject to the provisions of this chapter, any party may take the testimony of any person, including a party, by deposition upon oral examination or written interrogatories for the purpose of discovery, or for preparation of pleadings, or for preparation or trial of a case, or for use at a hearing upon petition, motion or rule, or for any combination of the foregoing purposes.

Official Note: See Rule 4003.8 governing precomplaint discovery.

Rule 4003.8. Pre-Complaint Discovery.

- (a) A plaintiff may obtain pre-complaint discovery where the information sought is material and necessary to the filing of the complaint and the discovery will not cause unreasonable annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, burden or expense to any person or party.
- (b) Upon a motion for protective order or other objection to a plaintiff's pre-complaint discovery, the court may require the plaintiff to state with particularity how the discovery will materially advance the preparation of the

complaint. In deciding the motion or other objection, the court shall weigh the importance of the discovery request against the burdens imposed on any person or party from whom the discovery is sought.

Rule 4005. Written Interrogatories to a Party.

(a) Subject to the limitations provided by Rule 4011, any party may serve upon any other party written interrogatories to be answered by the party served or, if the party served is a public or private corporation or similar entity or a partnership or association, by any officer or agent, who shall furnish such information as is available to the party. Interrogatories may be served upon any party at the time of service of the original process or at any time thereafter. Interrogatories which are to be served prior to service of the complaint shall be limited to the purpose of preparing a complaint and shall contain a brief statement of the nature of the cause of action. Interrogatories shall be prepared in such fashion that sufficient space is provided immediately after each interrogatory or subsection thereof for insertion of the answer or objection.

Official Note: Rule 440 requires the party serving interrogatories upon any other party to serve a copy upon every party to the action.

See Rule 4003.8 governing pre-complaint discovery.

Rule 4007.1. Procedure in Deposition by Oral Examination.

(c) The purpose of the deposition and matters to be inquired into need not be stated in the notice unless the action has been commenced by writ of summons and the plaintiff desires to take the deposition of any person upon oral examination for the purpose of preparing a com-

oral examination for the purpose of preparing a complaint. In such case the notice shall include a brief statement of the nature of the cause of action and of the matters to be inquired into.

Official Note: See Rule 4003.8 governing precomplaint discovery.

Explanatory Comment

Case law governing pre-complaint discovery has not developed a general rule of application. In his opinion addressing pre-complaint discovery in *McNeil v. Jordan*, 894 A.2d 1260 (2006), Justice Baer stated in a footnote that the matter would be referred to the Civil Procedural Rules Committee to consider the adequacy of the existing rules and "to recommend any amendments that might clarify this vexing area of civil procedure."

The Committee in proposing new Rule 4003.8 has established in subdivision (a) a two-prong test for precomplaint discovery: (1) the information sought must be material and necessary to the filing of the complaint and (2) "the discovery will not cause unreasonable annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, burden or expense to any person or party." The first prong incorporates the language of the opinion quoted above that the information sought be both "material and necessary" to the filing of a complaint in a pending action. The requirement of the opinion that there be "probable cause" that the information sought is material and necessary has not been

included in the rule. The language of the second prong that the discovery not cause "unreasonable annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, burden or expense" is taken verbatim from present Rule 4011(b) governing limitation of scope of discovery and deposition.

New Rule 4003.8(b) governs a motion for protective order or other objection to pre-complaint discovery. The court may require the plaintiff "to state with particularity how the discovery will materially advance the preparation of the complaint." The language "materially advance" is also derived from the opinion quoted above. The requirement set forth in the *McNeil* opinion of "probable cause for believing" the information will materially advance the pleading has not been retained.

Subdivision (b) confers discretion on the court in deciding a motion for pre-complaint discovery. It also incorporates the language of the opinion in the *McNeil* case, 894 A.2d at 1278-1279:

In practice, of course, a trial court addresses a discovery request not in abstract terms but in the context of the case at bar. In doing so, the court exercises significant discretion, weighing the importance of the request against the burdens imposed on the subject party to determine, as a practical matter, whether the discovery request should be permitted.

Rule 4001(c) refers to discovery for preparation of pleadings. Rules 4005(a) and 4007.1(c) refer, inter alia, to written interrogatories and depositions for the purpose of preparing a complaint. Notes are to be added to these rules cross-referring to new Rule 4003.8.

By the Civil Procedural Rules Committee

R. STANTON WETTICK, Jr.,

Chai.

 $[Pa.B.\ Doc.\ No.\ 07\text{-}1.\ Filed\ for\ public\ inspection\ January\ 5,\ 2007,\ 9\text{:}00\ a.m.]$

DISCIPLINARY BOARD OF THE SUPREME COURT

Notice of Transfer of Attorneys to Inactive Status

Notice is hereby given that the following attorneys have been transferred to inactive status by Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania dated November 15, 2006, pursuant to Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 219 which requires that all attorneys admitted to practice in any court of this Commonwealth must pay an annual assessment of \$175.00. The Order became effective December 15, 2006.

Notice with respect to attorneys having Pennsylvania registration addresses, which have been transferred to inactive status by said Order, was published in the appropriate county legal journal.

Amacker III, George A. Cherry Hill, NJ

Babst, David McNary Cleveland, OH

Bailey, Marchelle Glendale, CA

Bakst, Daren Lawrence Raleigh, NC Bennetsen, Julia Marie Haddon Township, NJ

Bernardo, Paul J. Astoria, NY

Bernstein, Leon Las Vegas, NV

Blaney, Dana Marie Cape May Court House, NJ

Bloom, Michael Jay Arlington, VA

Bodnar, Joseph J. Wilmington, DE

Booher, Erin Marie Bradenton, FL

Brennan, Patricia L. Kensington, MD

Brooks, Cornell William Woodbridge, VA

Bullion, Andrew Baker Washington, DC

Burgess, Susan K. Tampa, FL

Burke Jr., Roger William Washington, DC

Busby, W. Dawn Washington, DC

Butler, Harrison Robert Portugal

Carlin, Clair Myron Poland, OH

Carroll, Deborah A. Columbia, MD

Cessario, Lorraine Christie Elkton, MD

Cleaver, Michael David Verona. NJ

Colman, Tina Leah Honolulu, HI

Davis, Kenneth Robin Plano, TX

Dibble, Jaime Sue Arlington, VA

Dodd, Sabrina Marie Silver Spring, MD

Donnini, Elisabeth Murray Horseshoe, NC

Doris, Ian C. River Edge, NJ

Drury, John K. Charleston, SC

Dunlap II, John Barry Hagerstown, MD

Dutton, Melissa T. Collingswood, NJ

Elsetinow, Anthony L. Santa Ana, CA

Flamm, Aaron, Thomas Washington, DC

THE COURTS 9

Forbes, Lance Stuart McIntyre Jr., Carl H. Silver Spring, MD Moorestown, NJ Gayda, Michael Daniel Meacham, Shani A. San Antonio, TX Blackwood, NJ Georges, Marshall P. R. Mecleary Jr., George Howard Royal Palm Beach, FL Long Neck, DE Goldman, Mitchell A. Mendez Jr., Joaquin Foothill Ranch, CA Coral Gables, FL Green, Angela T'nia Messam Jr., Patrick Alonzo Washington, DC Bowie, MD Guerrero, Carol Velasquez Metzler, Suzanne Gisler New York, NY College Park, MD Micklin, Brad Michael Hartjen, Lee Christian Apalachin, NY Roseland, NJ Haumann, William Andrew Miller, Stephen Howard Hamilton, NJ Anniston, AL Mitchell, Robyn Charlene Jagadesan, Dev Washington, DC Atlanta, GA Mohnacs, John P. Jennifer, Nancie Susan Las Vegas, NV West Deptford, NJ Jones, Robert J. Naumoff-Dulski, Hannah Hull South Plainfield, NJ Denver, CO King, Jolie Kahn O'Grady, Kevin Plano, TX Bloomington, IN Konar, Malanchika O'Rourke, Brian Robert Voorhees, NJ Marlton, NJ Ophaug, Bradley Michael Kucskar, Kathryn A. Raleigh, NC Plano, TX Kutzenco, Allan Neal Oshtry, Daniel Ira Boston, MA Washington, DC Ott, Theresa M. Leary III, John James Washington, DC Oviedo, FL Leddy III, Francis James Pagano, Ralph V. Hackensack, NJ Cranbury, NJ Legere, Theresa Diane Palchick, Mark J. Washington, DC Yuma, AZ Levin, Robert G. B. Pelayo, Socorro Maria Lutherville, MD San Jose, CA Pellathy, Gabriel B. Levin, John Stuart Washington, DC Washington, DC Peterson, Donald Hamilton Levy, Jonathan Deitz Newark, NJ Washington, DC Lombardo, Adriana C. Pirozek, Christian Gerard Alexandria, VA Orlando, FL Polis II, Robert Arthur Luby Jr, John E. Williamstown, NJ Wildwood, NJ Madden, Matthew P. Pomar, Olga D. Haddonfield, NJ Camden, NJ Madrid, Daniel V. Porcaro, Kimberly Anne Freehold, NJ Morristown, NJ Maher, Steven J. Proko Jr., Peter J. Naples, FL Sewell, NJ Malkin, Arthur David Rednor, Howard S. Lake Hiawatha, NJ Trenton, NJ Mallace, Anthony N. Reyes, Arcadio Jorge Audubon, NJ Washington, DC

Marullo, Lori Rose

Woodstown, NJ

Bowie, MD

Romney, Norman D'Edward

Rosato, Jennifer L. Brooklyn, NY

Rosenberg, Marshall Ethan

Washington, DC

Rothmel, Michael Mt. Holly, NJ

Rynkiewicz, John P. Washington, DC

Sapirman, Louis Alan Short Hills, NJ

Shaffer, Gary Leigh Annapolis, MD

Sheldon, Steven James

Orlando, FL

Sheppard-Williams, Tselane K.

Sicklerville, NJ

Sok, Siphana Cambodia

Spence, Greggory Keith

Brooklyn, NY

Stamets, Russell Allen

India

Strnad, Sonya Miami, FL

Strong, Gregory Colleran

Wilmington, DE

Swoyer III, George William

Northfield, NJ

Taggart, Ward Shaffer

Trenton, NJ

Techentin, Julia Beauchamp

North Kingstown, RI

Tenny, Nathan Andrew

APO AE

Thaggert III, Henry Laynell

Arlington, VA

Tower, Elizabeth Corbin

Washington, DC

Weisberg, Martin S.

Marlton, NJ

Williams, Nicole J.

Washington, DC

Wilson, Timothy James

Wilmington, DE

Zis, Peter J. Richton Park. IL

ELAINE M. BIXLER,

Secretary
The Disciplinary Board of the
Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 07-2. Filed for public inspection January 5, 2007, 9:00 a.m.]

Notice of Transfer of Attorneys to Inactive Status

Notice is hereby given that the following attorneys have been transferred to inactive status by Order of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania dated November 21, 2006, pursuant to Rule 111(b) Pa.R.C.L.E., which requires that every active lawyer shall annually complete, during the compliance period for which he or she is assigned, the continuing legal education required by the Continuing Legal Education Board. The Order became effective December 21, 2006 for Compliance Group 1 due April 30, 2006. Notice with respect to attorneys having Pennsylvania registration addresses, which have been transferred to inactive status by said Order, was published in the appropriate county legal journal.

Barbour, Roger A. Maple Shade, NJ

Byrer, Robert Glenn Washington, DC

Campbell, Kelly Lynn

Camden, NJ

Drabkin, David Allan Springfield, VA

Edwards, Alice Riedman

West Chicago, IL

Grundy, Jenifer Edgefield, SC

Halbreich, Michael M.

Atlanta, GA

Hammerschmidt, Judith Lynne

Chevy Chase, MD

Jackson, Paul Reuben

Muskegon, MI

Kincade, Michael Joseph

Metaire, LA

Loughney, Robert M.

Albany, NY

Mastroianni, James J.

New York, NY

Muhr, William Wayne Colorado Springs, CO

Perrucci Jr., Angelo M.

Washington, NJ

Rai-Choudhury, Indira

Bellingham, WA

Schaufeld, Karen Grace

Lovettsville, VA

Wilson, Marian M. Long Beach, CA

> ELAINE M. BIXLER, Secretary The Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania

[Pa.B. Doc. No. 07-3. Filed for public inspection January 5, 2007, 9:00 a.m.]