

KATHLEEN GALLOGLY COX  
CIRCUIT ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE  
THIRD JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
CHAIR  
(410) 887-6510

LAURA KIESSLING  
CIRCUIT ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE  
FIFTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
VICE-CHAIR  
(410) 222-1290



FAYE D. GASKIN  
SECRETARY  
P: (410) 260-1257  
F: (410) 974-2066

**Conference of Circuit Judges**  
COURTS OF APPEAL BUILDING  
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
CONFERENCE OF CIRCUIT JUDGES**

A meeting of the Conference of Circuit Judges was held Monday, March 19, 2018, at the Judicial College Education and Conference Center in Annapolis, Maryland, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

**Members Present**

Hon. Kathleen Gallogly Cox, Chair

Hon. Brian D. Shockley  
Hon. Brett W. Wilson  
Hon. Keith A. Baynes  
Hon. Stephen H. Kehoe  
Hon. Mickey J. Norman  
Hon. W. Timothy Finan  
Hon. Viki M. Pauler  
Hon. J. Barry Hughes  
Hon. Laura S. Kiessling, Vice Chair

Hon. Theresa M. Adams  
Hon. Robert A. Greenberg  
Hon. Sheila R. Tillerson Adams  
Hon. Marjorie L. Clagett  
Hon. W. Michel Pierson  
Hon. Amy Craig  
Pamela Harris  
Douglas Hofstedt

**Also, Present Were:**

Hon. Alan M. Wilner  
Hon. John P. Morrissey  
Hon. Nicholas E. Rattal  
Hon. Sean D. Wallace  
Faye Gaskin  
Gray Barton  
Jennifer Boswell  
Kelley O'Connor

Susan Macek  
Eliana Pangelinan  
Lee Robinson  
Nisa Subasinghe  
Russell Butler  
Chief Gary Gardner  
Sheriff Darren Popkin  
Deputy Sheriff Bruce Sherman

## **1. Approval of Minutes**

Judge Cox called for approval of the minutes of the January 8, 2018, meeting. Judge Baynes moved for approval of the minutes, which was seconded by Judge Clagett. The motion passed.

## **2. Business and Technology Case Management Recommendations**

Judge Nicholas Rattal and Judge Sean Wallace briefed the Conference on the report and recommendations of the Maryland State Bar Association Business Law Section Ad Hoc Task Force's report and recommendations regarding the management of business and technology cases. They began their presentation by providing a background on the Business and Technology Case Management Program (BTCMP), which began in 2000 and was the first such program in the country. The program was created to establish a coordinated, efficient, and responsive manner to manage business and technology cases in the Circuit Courts.

In 2014, the MSBA, in partnership with the Baltimore and University of Maryland's law schools, embarked upon a study of the management of business and technology cases. They surveyed stakeholders, gathered best practices from around the country, and held a symposium in the spring of 2016, all culminating with a report and proposed recommendations. The task force proffered to the BTCMP three proposals concerning structural changes to the management of business and technology cases. Proposal A entailed the creation of a statewide business court with 3-4 judges designated by the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals to serve as program judges and to handle cases statewide. With this proposal, circuit administrative judges would nominate judges from the courts within their respective circuits for consideration to participate in the program. The Chief Judge would then designate program judges from the list of nominees. The cases would be assigned on a rotating basis to the program judges and the parties would be asked to waive venue, allowing for cases to be heard in the program judge's court. If the parties choose not to waive venue, the program judge would have to be specially assigned to hear matters in the court in which the case is filed.

With Proposal B, a statewide program coordinator would be appointed and would report directly to the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals. The coordinator's responsibilities would include reviewing and assigning cases to the BTCMP; developing uniform forms, procedures, and protocols; monitoring the assignment of judges, publication of opinions, and educational programs; and coordinating and maintaining the BTCMP website. The administrative judges would retain authority over the BTCMP judges.

Under Proposal C, a program advisory board would be created. The board, comprised of seven members, including sitting BTCMP judges, sitting appellate judges, former judges, practitioners, and business and community leaders. The task force recommends that the advisory board be included in Proposals A and B. Further, if the board is the only change made, it should be responsible for those tasks outlined under Proposal B for the program coordinator. The advisory board also would review the program every three years, submitting a report of its findings and recommendations to the Chief Judge. Additionally, the advisory board would appoint a subcommittee comprised of sitting BTCMP judges to serve as an opinion review committee to review opinions written by program judges, if requested, before they are published.

The task force also recommended that program judges have an interest and willingness to serve and that their business, finance, or technical background be considered. In addition, the task force recommended that business and technology cases not be assigned on top of the judge's regular caseload. The task force recommended including only complaints seeking a minimum of \$100,000 or complaints where the relief being sought is primarily injunctive or equitable. In addition, the task force recommends that cases be presumptively included in the program based on defined aspects of the cases.

The task force noted that there is not a large body of law on business litigation issues and, as such, recommended more written opinions that would be published on the Judiciary's website. In addition, the task force recommended that litigants be allowed to cite the opinions, not as binding, but as a body of law. The task force suggested that there be an increase in filing fees to fund education, as well as technology in the courtrooms to facilitate business and technology cases.

Judge Wallace noted that the Business and Technology Subcommittee supported unanimously the recommendations with the exception of changes to the structure. It was the opinion of a number of subcommittee members that the selection of business and technology judges and assignment of cases should be under the purview of the administrative judges, based on uniform criteria, while others support assignment by a program coordinator, as outlined in Proposal A as the only way to create an effective business court program. The members noted that if a centralized core of business and technology judges is approved, the number of judges should range from 7-10 rather than the 3-4 recommended by the task force, which would minimize disruptions to court dockets. The subcommittee supported the creation of an advisory board under Proposal C, but noted that it should be advisory only and not given the level of authority recommended by the task force.

Judge Rattal stated that the Specialty Courts and Dockets Committee adopted the recommendations with the exception of Proposal A, voting (6 in favor, 5 opposed) to recommend the use of senior judges rather than sitting judges, which would alleviate the impact to operations. One committee member voted to adopt Proposal A as recommended by the task force. The sentiment of the committee was to oppose the use of only 3-4 judges. The committee expressed concern regarding the lack of uniformity among the counties and noted that having only 3-4 judges handle all business and technology cases statewide is logistically unworkable. Judge Rattal stated that the committee consists primarily of problem-solving court judges, with more District Court than Circuit Court judges who do not have the experience with business and technology cases. The committee sought feedback from the Conference prior to presenting the recommendations to the Judicial Council.

Judge Cox noted that legislation introduced to create a statewide court (Proposal A) was opposed by the Judiciary. She added that based on statistics submitted by the Department of Legislative Services, there were only 53 cases designated as business and technology in Fiscal Year 2017. Of that number, 29 were filed in Montgomery County. Most counties did not have any cases. Judge Kiessling expressed concerns with jurisdiction and logistics with respect to Proposal A, noting that the Chief Judge would have to cross-designate everyone. Regarding Proposal B, Judge Kiessling stated that the recommendation takes authority away from the administrative judges and that while she agrees with the need for more education and resources, she is unsure about the use of uniform forms, adding that the courts are working on their

differentiated case management plans and scheduling orders, which vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Judge Pierson acknowledged that the various programs have not been as strong as they could have been and that there are resource issues, but he continues to question the fact that the push is coming from the bar rather than the business community. Judge Kehoe expressed concern with the recommendation that opinions be cited as they may be viewed as having the force of law. He noted, however, that it would be helpful to publish the opinions for review by practitioners. Judge Greenberg expressed concern regarding the number of cases, noting that the small number of cases does not warrant the potential disruption that could be caused by Proposals A and B.

Judge Sheila Adams questioned who the advisory board would be advising to which Judge Wallace responded that it would advise the Chief Judge regarding things such as lack of uniformity and timeliness. Judge Cox commented that a work group of the Specialty Courts and Dockets Committee would be more in line with the Judicial Council's committee structure.

Judge Kiessling moved that Conference support the creation of a work group, under the Specialty Courts and Dockets Committee, to address business and technology case management issues and concerns, rather than an advisory board as recommended by the task force. The motion was seconded by Judge Sheila Adams. The motion passed by a majority vote. Judge Pierson opposed the motion. Judge Kiessling proposed that the work group consider the criteria for selection of business and technology program cases. Judge Cox added that the work group should review the business and technology caseload statistics for accuracy.

### **3. Maryland Crime Victims' Resource Center**

Russell Butler appeared before the Conference to discuss resources available through the Maryland Crime Victims' Resource Center (the Center). He noted that the Center was formed in 1982 to provide services for victims of crime and to advocate for changes in public policy related to the same. The majority of the funding is in the form of federal grants, which are provided through the Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP). The Center is restructuring to form regional offices to ensure resources are available across the State. Staff have been hired for the main office, as well as the regional offices. Staff attorneys serve in three areas, including in a limited appearance capacity for crime victims and representatives, as guardian ad litem for crime victims and representatives, and to file amicus briefs.

Mr. Butler commented on issues regarding the collection of restitution. He stated that some of the changes made through JRA to address issues include caps on parole and probation violations that include failure to pay restitution, permitting 25 percent of an inmate's earnings to be paid toward restitution, and requiring the Division of Parole and Probation (DPP) to include restitution when developing work plans.

Mr. Butler also discussed Criminal Procedure Title 11, Subtitle 6, which requires DPP to notify the court of violations regarding restitution and to request earnings withholding if the defendant is employed. In addition, DPP is required to refer the matter to the Central Collection Unit if supervision is terminated. Mr. Butler highlighted a number of alternatives, allowed by law, to the Central Collection Unit that may be more effective in collecting restitution. They

include extending probation for five years for the sole purpose of collecting restitution and using earnings withholding orders to collect restitution. Legislation was introduced to create a Victims Services Unit in GOCCP whose responsibilities would include a comprehensive review of restitution practices.

Judge Finan commented that there is a sense that there is some type of barrier to sending restitution collections to CCU, adding that he gets forms from DPP indicating the collection was deemed uncollectible. Judge Kiessling expressed concern with the fee charged by DPP for collection even if the order indicates that the fee is waived. Mr. Butler stated that the statute provides for a 2 percent collection fee for DPP and the Department of Juvenile Services, but after the victim receives restitution monies.

#### **4. Time Frames for Law Enforcement to Hold Defendants on Bench Warrants**

Sheriff Darren Popkin (Montgomery County), Chief Gary Gardner (Howard County), and Deputy Sheriff Bruce Sherman (Montgomery County) appeared before the Conference to discuss an issue raised during a previous meeting regarding the length of time law enforcement will hold defendants arrested with an outstanding bench warrant for another jurisdiction. Both Montgomery and Howard counties indicated that they have established best practices and model policies and, as such, they have not encountered any issues. Sheriff Popkin stated that he surveyed his colleagues from across the state and the majority indicated that they dispatch officers to the arresting jurisdiction to pick up the defendant. In some smaller jurisdictions with limited staff or in the western or eastern counties where the drive could be up to six hours, they try to make arrangements with the arresting jurisdiction to hold defendants for a longer period of time. Sheriff Popkin added that the Sheriff's Offices don't necessarily run corrections, who won't hold without a commitment, which causes a tremendous burden to the court system.

Judge Clagett stated that there have been problems with the arresting jurisdictions not providing enough travel time for the receiving jurisdictions to pick up the defendants and the defendants have been released. She added that the sentiment of the Conference was to have a uniform time of 72 hours. Sheriff Popkin stated that the Sheriff's Office does not run corrections in Montgomery County, but will hold the individuals in central processing as long as possible. They are not permitted to put the defendants in detention without a commitment.

Judge Pauler commented that she initially raised the issue because her court was advised that Washington County was given 30 minutes to pick up a defendant, which is impossible from that location regardless of the arresting jurisdiction. Additionally, her court was informed that if law enforcement from Hagerstown arrests an individual and calls the jurisdiction responsible for picking up the individual, the office is told that the responsible agency is not coming and that they have to release the individual. Judge Pauler stated that while this is an issue between law enforcement agencies, it impacts the courts when agencies don't honor the courts' orders. Sheriff Popkin stated that he has heard similar stories, adding that he doesn't have problems with dispatching; his problem is with other agencies not picking up individuals and the statutory problem with putting people in detention without a commitment. Judge Sheila Adams asked if the agencies indicate in writing that they are not going to pick up the defendant. Sheriff Popkin responded that there is no statewide policy or procedure, but he requests something in writing.

Judge Kehoe inquired as to whether there is a database for the arresting officer to check to determine if there is an active warrant to which Sheriff Popkin responded that it depends on the arresting agency. Judge Hughes asked if the agencies have checked to determine if they are interpreting the statute properly. Sheriff Popkin stated that is not aware of an Attorney General's opinion on the matter.

Deputy Sheriff Sherman noted that there is a disparity between the District and Circuit Courts regarding presentment of defendants on a bench warrant. The provision to take the defendant before a judicial officer, depending on the content of the warrant, could be different. If the warrant indicates to take the defendant to a specific judge, the arresting agency cannot hold the defendant in the arresting jurisdiction. Deputy Sheriff Sherman suggested changing the language in the warrant to indicate that a Circuit Court warrant can be returned/presented to the District Court. The commissioner could then hold the proceeding and commit the defendant.

Judge Cox commented that the suggestion to get an AG's opinion or to review the Rules might be the direction in which to go. Judge Sheila Adams noted that she has reviewed a number of rules and that the language in the warrants may have to be changed so that on any Circuit Court warrant the defendant can be taken before a District Court commissioner for bond or to be taken to jail.

#### **5. Proposed Rules Revisions to Bench Warrants for VOPs for Technical Violations Under JRA and Authority of Clerks to Issue Warrants**

Judge Wilner discussed with the Conference a request from Judge Philip Caroom (*retired*), Paul DeWolfe, and Stuart Simms to consider amendments to Rule 4-347 to address statutory and public policy conflicts created with the passage of the Justice Reinvestment Act (JRA), which sets incarceration limits for technical violations. They expressed concern that Rule 4-347 allows a judge to deny bail or not provide a bail review prior to decisions on probation violations. Additionally, they noted that many judges require detention for violations before adjudication. Doing so may result in penalties that exceed the statutory caps for technical violations. The requestors noted that public policy research was foundational in determining the technical violation standards.

To address the conflicts, the requestors suggested amendments to Rule 4-347 that would in effect prohibit a judge from issuing no-bail warrants for first, second, or third technical violations of probation unless the defendant has failed to appear in the past. Additionally, they suggested that the Rule be amended to provide that the court set the earliest available hearing date if the defendant is held in pretrial detention for technical violations, or that the defendant be released on his or her own recognizance after having served the amount of time permitted for a first, second, or third technical violation. Finally, the requestors recommended an amendment that would require the administrative judge to assign the violation of probation to another judge if the sentencing judge cannot hear the matter in a timely manner.

The second matter Judge Wilner discussed was raised by Chief Judge Morrissey regarding body attachments. Chief Judge Morrissey, prompted by an article in the Daily Record questioning whether defendants' due process rights are violated when body attachments are issued without the individual being physically served, inquired whether changes to Rules 2-633 and 3-633 to eliminate the use of substituted service in body attachment cases should be

considered. If changed, creditors would have to personally serve the defendants or use certified mail in debt collection cases.

Finally, Judge Wilner discussed an issue brought to his attention by Pamela Harris with respect to Rule 4-212 regarding the authority to issue warrants. There is agreement that the Rule is clear that in the District Court, a judge or commissioner, depending on the circumstances, may issue a warrant. There is, however, disagreement amongst judges, Clerks of Court, and the Attorney General's Office regarding interpretation of the Rule for issuance of warrants in the Circuit Courts. While some interpret the language that the "court may order" to mean that only judges can issue warrants, others interpret it to mean that judges may verbally authorize a clerk to issue warrants.

Judge Wilner sought the Conference's feedback on each of the matters which are pending before the subcommittee. With respect to bench warrants for technical probation violations, discussion ensued about whether there should be some specificity in the Rules regarding JRA provisions. Judge Wilner commented that if the petition is based solely on technical violations, then it should so state. He added that the issue is that Circuit Court sentencing judges want defendants brought before them only and that the matter needs to be addressed in a specified period of time for pre-trial release purposes. Judge Sheila Adams suggested that a procedure be established to ensure the case is heard either by the sentencing judge or bail/bond judge, if necessary, at the next court session. She suggested that if the defendant is to be returned to a particular judge, the warrant should have language indicating that the matter will be heard the next day court is in session. A number of Conference members expressed concern about the "next day." Judge Cox suggested that Circuit Court judges not have everything returnable to the Circuit Court. Judge Wilson stated that most of his warrants indicate to return to him. He added that judges need to have discretion, but the problem is when the defendant is not seen the next day. A number of judges indicated that they hold the hearing on the next day and have not encountered any problems. Judge Shockley indicated that Worcester County holds the hearing the next business day and it is not restricted to the sentencing judge.

In discussing the matter of body attachments, Judge Cox suggested that the Rules Committee wait to see if SB 1050 passes because, if it does, there will be a process put into place. The Conference expressed concern that people are being held on body attachments without being personally served.

Regarding who is authorized to issue warrants, Judge Wilson noted that some clerks want their signatures scanned on arrest warrants. He stressed that someone can be deprived of his or her liberty and, as such, the warrant should be carefully reviewed and personally signed. Judge Finan stated that he puts on the record that he orders issuance of the warrant, after which it is docketed and the clerk issues and signs the warrant. Judge Wilner inquired as to the documentation when the clerk signs the warrant since the clerk makes the docket entry. He added that the order of the judge either has to be on the record or the warrant signed by the judge.

## **6. Sick/Safe Leave**

Lee Robinson and Jennifer Boswell provided an overview of the Maryland Healthy Working Families Act (HB 1, 2017 Session) that became effective February 11, 2018. The Act requires employers of a certain size to allow employees to earn one hour of paid sick/safe leave

for every 30 hours the employee works. Under the Act, employees can carry over a maximum of 40 hours of leave, but cannot accrue or use more than 64 hours per year. Employees may be required to give advanced notice if the absence is foreseeable, but if not foreseeable, advanced notice is not required. Employers may, however, deny the leave if the required notice is not provided and the absence would cause a disruption to operations. Upon separation from employment, the employer may compensate the employee for unused leave, but is not required to do so. Additionally, the employer can provide advanced leave, which can be deducted from the employee's final check if he or she leaves employment early.

The sick/safe leave can be used to treat the employee's or family member's illness or condition; for the employee's or a family member's doctors' appointments; for maternity or paternity leave; and for absences resulting from domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking committed against the employee or a family member.

Mr. Robinson noted that Judiciary employees most likely already earn the required amount of leave provided by this Act. Judge Cox commented that the matter was placed on the agenda for consideration regarding judicial assistants who work at the judge's discretion. She added that if their leave has not previously been tracked, then it will have to be tracked going forward. Mr. Robinson stated that the Judiciary Human Resources Department is available to provide assistance if needed.

## **7. Designated Point of Contact for the MDH, Job Description, and Best Practices**

Judge Hughes and Judge Kehoe, as a follow-up from the previous meeting, presented a draft administrative order for the appointment of Department of Health liaison judges and a spreadsheet that can be used to track compliance of evaluation and commitment orders. The draft administrative order included provisions addressing statutory authority for evaluation and commitment, policy considerations, appointment of the liaison judge, and the action anticipated by the court.

Judge Kehoe questioned whether or not MDEC is able to track and assign MDH judges. Further discussion was tabled until the May meeting to provide time to make that determination. Judge Hughes agreed to follow-up when the MDEC team is in his court for go-live support.

## **8. Maryland Rule 2-507 Notices**

Judge Cox polled the Conference to determine if their courts are promptly sending out 2-507 notices. Judge Pierson stated that there is no delay in sending out the notices in his court, but commented that the 120 days to send the notice, coupled with the 30 days to respond provides a lot of time for attorneys and parties to act or not. Judge Hughes stated that in Carroll County the clerk follows-up in 5-10 days; if there is no proof of service, then the plaintiff is brought in for a show cause hearing.

## **9. Senior Judges Approval Process**

Judge Cox stated that there is a proposal to centrally approve the usage of senior judges, but noted that there is a statute or rule that provides for the administrative judge to assign senior judges to hear cases in their respective courts. This was informational only.



## **10. ICE Enforcement in Courthouses**

Judge Cox distributed to the Conference *Policy Directive* 11072.1 (Civil Immigration Enforcement Actions Inside Courthouses) and an informational document created by the National Center for State Courts on the background of the policy. She noted that the Conference of Chief Justices created a workgroup to discuss ways to improve relationships between state courts and the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Members of the workgroup and representatives from ICE met on a number of occasions to discuss the matter and to offer recommendations on possible changes to existing policy. The workgroup asked if ICE would revise its policy to designate court facilities as sensitive facilities, which would result in enforcement activities taking place in and around court facilities only in exigent circumstances. The request was denied, but the policy was revised to address other recommendations.

One change was to release the document in the form of a policy directive, which means that it is available to the public. Other changes included ICE seeking, within court facilities, only those individuals who have criminal records, are gang members, are national security threats, or have already been ordered by a court to be removed from the United States; targeting, in court facilities, only individuals subject to enforcement actions and not their family members; engaging in enforcement activities only in areas designated for criminal proceedings; and having enforcement activities take in non-public areas of the courthouse in collaboration with court security. The Conference of Chief Justices plans to recommend state-level meetings with ICE officials to discuss the provisions and implementation of the new policy. Judge Cox noted that she plans to set-up regional meetings.

Judge Sheila Adams noted issues with ICE agents sitting in the courtroom to observe the proceedings and then detaining individuals as they exit. She is considering requiring officers to justify the need to bring firearms into the courtroom. The Sheriff recommends that all law enforcement officers provide a summons for official court business to carry firearms in the courthouse. If unable to do so, the officer would be required to check his or her firearms at the door.

Judge Greenberg stated that there is a policy in his court where ICE informs the Sheriff in advance that the officers will be in the courthouse. They are not permitted to arrest individuals in the courthouse.

Judge Cox asked that the Conference advise her and Chief Judge Morrissey of any issues.

## **11. 2018 Judicial Conference Circuit Court Session**

Judge Kiessling stated that there will be two-hour court specific sessions at the Judicial Conference. The Circuit Court workgroup continues to work on ideas for discussion. Judge Cox agreed to moderate as Chair of the Conference of Circuit Judges and will discuss the structure of the Conference. Judge Kiessling noted that some of the topics discussed thus far include security for judges with an emphasis on challenges outside of the courthouse as courthouses are becoming more secure; a discussion with Judge Wilner regarding the impact of Rules changes on the Circuit Courts; and the impact of JRA on sentencing. Judge Claggett suggested discussing how JRA will impact specialty courts in terms of probation. Judge Kiessling suggested the

possibility of a discussion with a small panel of drug court judges.

Any ideas should be sent to Judge Kiessling.

## **12. Oaths for Magistrates**

Judge Sheila Adams inquired as to whether courts require magistrates to take oaths. Her research indicated that oaths are only required of judges. The Administrative Office of the Courts' Legal department concluded that magistrates should take an oath. Some Conference members indicated that magistrates in their courts take oaths, while others noted that they would inquire because they were not certain.

## **13. True Testing**

Judge Sheila Adams asked if clerks are true testing documents submitted to the court, noting that during a recent meeting of the Seventh Circuit, clerks discussed the problems encountered with sovereign citizens having their documents true tested and then circulating them as official court documents. Amy Craig stated that in Dorchester County they only true test documents the court issues and stamps incoming documents as received. She will raise the issue at the meeting of the Conference of Circuit Court Clerks.

## **14. Petition to Correct Birth Certificate**

Judge Sheila Adams asked how courts are handling petitions from the Moors requesting to correct their birth certificates, not as it relates to their sex, but rather their nationality as a member of the Moors. Judge Pierson suggested that the pleading be struck, to which the Conference agreed.

## **15. Domestic Law Committee – Hearings in Guardianship Cases**

Judge Cox brought to the Conference's attention a concern raised by the Guardianship/Vulnerable Adult Workgroup regarding the issuance of guardianship orders without a hearing. Judge Callahan, in a letter to Chief Judge Barbera, expressed concern that the due process rights of disabled persons are possibly being violated as a result. She noted that statute and rule both require an initial hearing to be held prior to issuing guardianship orders. Chief Judge Barbera asked that this matter be brought before the Conference and that administrative judges remind their benches of the requirement.

## **16. For the Good of the Order**

Judge Pierson reminded the Conference that he previously raised the issue of strengthening the rules regarding cell phones in the courtroom. He stated that if the Sheriff seizes a cellphone pursuant to the rules, the Sheriff can confiscate it until the individual leaves the building. He asked about the authority to review the contents of the cellphone for prohibited material. Judge Sheila Adams commented that she addressed the problem in her court by purchasing pouches to store the cellphones. If there is a high profile case, or based on the judge's discretion, cellphones are placed in pouches until the individuals leave the courthouse. She will provide information on the pouches.

### Action Items

- Judge Hughes will inquire as to whether MDEC can assign and track MDH liaison judges.
- Conference members should advise Judge Cox and Chief Judge Morrissey of any issues with ICE enforcement activities in the courthouse.
- Ms. Craig will raise the issue of true testing incoming documents with the Conference of Circuit Court Clerks.
- Conference members should ensure that administrative judges remind their benches of the requirement to hold an initial hearing before issuing guardianship orders.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m. The next meeting will be held on Monday, May 21, 2018, at the Judicial College Education and Conference Center in Annapolis, Maryland. The meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Faye Gaskin".

Faye D. Gaskin  
Conference Secretary