

North Dakota Law Review

Volume 69 | Number 3

Article 11

1993

Editor's Note

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.und.edu/ndlr



Part of the Law Commons

Recommended Citation

(1993) "Editor's Note," North Dakota Law Review: Vol. 69: No. 3, Article 11. Available at: https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol69/iss3/11

This Note is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Dakota Law Review by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commons@library.und.edu.

EDITOR'S NOTE

The NORTH DAKOTA LAW REVIEW is pleased to present the Report of the Civil Justice Reform Act Advisory Group and the U.S. District Court's Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan for the District of North Dakota. The development of the report and plan began in 1991 after Congress passed the Civil Justice Reform Act. That Act requires each federal district court, in conjunction with an Advisory Group, to create a plan to remedy costs and delays in the federal trial courts. As a result, the Honorable Patrick A. Conmy, then Chief District Judge, appointed an advisory group to assist the court in developing its plan.

The draft plan proposed by the Advisory Group to the Court is on file with the United States District Court in Fargo, North Dakota. The Advisory Group's Report and the Plan as adopted by the Court were first officially bound and sent to government officials in October, 1993 in order to meet Act deadlines and distribution requirements. The final Report and Plan now appear in this volume of the LAW REVIEW to ensure that both are widely distributed within North Dakota's legal and lay communities.

Because the Report and Plan are official documents, the LAW REVIEW has forgone its usual editing process to preserve the work of the Advisory Group and Court. However, due to the nature of the LAW REVIEW publication process, slight variations exist between the original Report and Plan and the Report and Plan as published herein. These technical changes were made with the Advisory Group's and the Court's authorization, respectively, and they do not in any way change the meaning or substance of the Advisory Group's Report or the Court's Plan. For example, new internal references have been inserted in the Advisory Group's Report and the Court's Plan to conform with pagination changes. In addition, minor corrections have been made to the tables on pages 758 and 760-61. Finally, to conserve space, blank lines have been deleted in portions of the enclosed surveys.

