

IN THE MATTER OF)
NOTICE OF AMENDED DISTRICT RULE)
FOR COURTS OF RECORD IN)
JUDICIAL DISTRICT 19)

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDED RULE
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDICIAL DISTRICT 19
February 3, 2016**

In accordance with Trial Rule 81 of the Indiana Court Rules, the judges of **Judicial District 19**, which includes the counties the **Clay, Putnam, Sullivan and Vigo**, hereby give notice to the bar and the public that the Courts propose to amend their district plan. New language is indicated by underlining and deleted language by strike-through.

Comment Period and Effective Date

The time period for the bar and the public to comment will begin on **February 3, 2016**, and will close on **March 3, 2016**. The effective date for the amended District Plan will be **January 1, 2016**.

Comments

Comments by the bar and the public should be made in writing and mailed, or emailed, to:

Honorable David R. Bolk, Judge of the Vigo Circuit/Superior Court Division 3, Vigo County Courthouse, 33 South 3rd Street, Terre Haute, Indiana 47807; or dabolk@aol.com.

A paper copy of the proposed amended district rule will be made available for viewing in the offices of the Clerks of **Clay, Putnam, Sullivan and Vigo** during normal business hours.

For the Courts of Record of Judicial District 19,

David R. Bolk, Judge
Vigo Circuit/ Superior Court Division 3

ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT 19
CLAY, PUTNAM, SULLIVAN AND VIGO COUNTIES
GOVERNANCE PLAN
(Effective ~~04/01/13~~ 01/01/16)

(A) Special Judge Plans: Our District has reviewed the TR 79 plans in each county and have determined each plan is current and allows for the efficient operation of special judge assignments in the District. Our District will only use judges within the District 19 for reassignment in Civil Cases.

(B) Criminal Rule 2.2: Our District has reviewed the current Criminal Rule 2.2 Plans for the counties in our District. We have determined that the counties in our District currently follow the provisions of Criminal Rules 2.2, 12, and 13.

(C) Leadership: From among the alternatives suggested to comply with AR 3(B), our District reviewed the suggested choices: (1) administrative judge/committee or (2) other specified organization established by the district. We have decided to select option two. We have selected Judge ~~Christopher Newton~~ **Michael J. Lewis**, to fulfill this role from ~~April 1, 2013~~ **January 1, 2016**, through December 31, ~~2013~~ **2016**, based on a seniority system we have been using in the past among the trial judges/magistrates in our District, for specific administrative matters only. He will be known as the “Administrative Judge.” Thereafter, the administrative judge will be chosen by the seniority list currently in effect that was utilized to select Judge ~~Newton~~ **Lewis** to this position ~~in~~ **for** calendar year ~~2013~~ **2016**. The Seniority List is attached hereto for examination. By election, we have selected, a different judge, Judge ~~Joseph Trout~~ **Robert E. Hunley, II**, as our representative to the Judicial Conference Board. Judge ~~Trout~~ **Hunley** will be our sole representative to the Board and will have the authority to cast all of the District’s votes allotted to the District. His term shall expire on December 31, ~~2014~~ **2016**.

(D) Selection Process for Leadership: The term for the administrative judge shall be one year. The trial judges/magistrates in the District met and elected to continue the current seniority based system for choosing the administrative judge. At the end of each calendar year, the current administrative judge will notify his successor based on the seniority list and forward all necessary documentation and computer files to him/her by January 10th of the new year. The term for the representative to the Judicial Conference Board shall be two (2) years. At the expiration of the two (2) year term, the current Board representative will solicit nominees from among the trial judges to be successor representative and a ballot vote will be taken among all trial judges/magistrates in District 19 either at a scheduled District Meeting or by accepted electronic means.

(E) Number of meetings: This District will hold one meeting per year and it will be organized by the administrative judge. A majority of the judges in the District will constitute a quorum to conduct business. Proxy votes at the District meeting can be cast as long as the administrative judge receives a written notice by facsimile or email prior to the start of the meeting designating the judge’s proxy or the proxy provides an executed proxy instrument prior to or at the commencement of the meeting. Meetings will be conducted in person or electronically, or via conference call as determined by the needs of the District.

(F) District Activities:

(1) Our District is cooperating on TR 79 and CR 2.2 Plans.

(2) Our District has an established Pro Bono Program.

~~(3) Our District currently shares judicial resources in Civil Tort cases.~~

~~Sullivan County accepts one hundred (100) Civil Tort cases per year from Vigo County to alleviate congestion of Vigo County's Civil Court dockets. The District will continue to investigate sharing of judicial resources when more resources become available.~~

(G) Local Rules: Local District Rules including this Governance Plan will be reviewed at the annual District Meeting. Any changes, additions, and/or revisions will be approved by a majority of the judicial officers in the District.

(H) Compliance: Our District Plan complies with the minimum requirements for District governance contemplated by AR 3(B). A majority of the judges in the District agreed to this plan on **12-31-15**. It will remain in effect until further notice.