

**APPELLATE COURT RULES COMMITTEE
TWO-YEAR-CYCLE AMENDMENTS
2000-2002** [Last revised: October 4, 2001]

<u>RULE:</u>	<u>VOTE TAKEN ON:</u>	<u>ACTION:</u>
9.040(b)(2)(A)	Editorial	Correct grammatical error (i.e., change “which” to “that”)
9.120 (f)	6/23/00 Approved 36-0	Adds requirement of submission of an appendix containing a conformed copy of the district court’s decision in order to resolve the apparent inconsistency between Rules 9.120 & 9.220.
9.140(b)(5)	9/15/00 Approved 36-5	Redesignated as new rule 9.140(d) as amended. (See below).
9.140(d) (was 9.140(b)(5))	9/15/00 Approved 36-5 6/22/01 Housekeeping changes to 9-15-00 draft unanimously approved	Former rule 9.140(b)(5) is renumbered as 9.140(d) and amended in response to <i>State v. White</i>, 742 So.2d 374 (Fla. 2d DCA 1999) to provide that the requirements trial defense counsel must satisfy before withdrawing from an appeal filed by the defense also apply to an appeal filed by the state. Thus, under the amended rule, trial defense counsel remains responsible for the case when the state appeals and cannot withdraw without obtaining substitute counsel.
9.140(b)(6)	Editorial	Renumbering. 9.140(b)(6) becomes (b)(5) with the redesignation of former (b)(5). (e)–(k) are relettered as the new (d) is added.
9.140 (d)–(h)	Editorial	Renumbering. Former 9.140(d)–(h) now become 9.140(e)–(i) due to creation of new 9.140 (d).
9.141 - 2000 committee notes	Editorial	Change “First District” to “First District Court of Appeal” in Committee Note (2000 Amendment) for reasons of style

9.180(c)(3)	9/07/01 Approved 45-0	Adds phrase “any necessary” to reflect legislative changes taking effect October 1, 2001, that will eliminate the requirement that a judge of compensaiton claims approve the entirety of a settlement if the employee/claimant is represented by counsel.
9.190 (e)(1); 2000 committee notes	Editorial	Grammatical changes: change “where” to “when” in (e)(1); change “which” to “that” in committee notes (2000 amendment).
9.330(a)	1/19/01 Approved 32-8	Allows a party to ask for an opinion upon receiving a PCA if the party certifies a written opinion would provide a legitimate basis for Supreme Court review.
9.330(a)	Editorial	Add commas.
9.330(a)	9/07/01 Approved 40-0	Partially amends the 1/19/01 amendment by changing the earlier approved phrase “the order is a per curiam affirmance without opinion” to “a decision is entered”; and adds a 2002 committee note explaining amendment.
9.330(d)	9/07/01 Approved 45-3	Adds language in response to supreme court request that rule be amended to clarify that the court does not accept motions for rehearing or clarification of its grant or denial of requests for discretionary review.
9.330; 2002 amendment committee note	9/07/01	Adds 2002 Amendment committee note explaining amendment to 9.330(a).
9.370	1/13/00 Approved 43-0	Adds cover identification requirement and lowers the time frames to 5 days, which would become 10 days if service was by mail.
9.440(a) -(b)	9/07/01 Approved 44-1	Amendment of rule and addition of committee note to bring rule into conformity with recently revised Rules of Judicial Administration 2.060 and 2.061 regarding foreign attorneys and withdrawing attorneys.

9.800(n)	9/15/00 Approved 40-4	Includes the ALWD Citation Manual as an alternative to the Bluebook for citations that do not appear in the rule.
9.800(i)	9/07/01 Approved 40-0	Deletes reference to “article” in citation to Florida Bar Admission rules to conform to supreme court’s 1997 rule change.

Table\current.amd

G:\Appeal\Rule Cycle\Cycle