

*Law Offices of  
Riley & Proly*  
*Oak Trail Professional Center*  
*202 Oak Trail Way*  
*Port Richey, Florida 33568*  
813 863-1553

*Bart A. Riley*  
PERSONAL INJURY & WRONGFUL DEATH  
TRIAL PRACTICE  
MARITAL AND FAMILY LAW

*Craig A. Laporte*  
GENERAL PRACTICE  
PERSONAL INJURY & WRONGFUL DEATH  
MARITAL AND FAMILY LAW

**FILED**

SID J. WHITE

MAR 27 1986

CLERK, SUPREME COURT

By   
Chief Deputy Clerk

*Peter A. Proly*  
CRIMINAL LAW  
MARITAL AND FAMILY LAW  
PERSONAL INJURY & WRONGFUL DEATH

March 24, 1986

The Office of the Clerk  
Supreme Court of Florida  
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Re: Proposed Emergency Amendment to Rule 1.100, Florida Rules  
of Civil Procedure, Case No. 68357

Dear Sirs:

I have reviewed the proposed Amendment to Rule 1.100 as published in The Florida Bar News on March 15, 1986. The proposed changes strike me as a move by the Clerks of the various Courts to avoid their own duties while placing further burdens on the attorneys' offices. Florida currently provides for a substantial filing fee payable at the commencement of any action. The proposed rules and forms clearly constitute nothing more than an attempt to pass administrative duties on to the attorneys' staff, reducing the work load of the Clerk's offices.

I do not believe that it is proper, nor do I believe it is fair to pass this additional burden on to the attorneys', their staffs, and ultimately on to the clients. The proposed civil cover sheet and final disposition form clearly are for the Clerk's convenience. Any time the Court itself has a file, it knows in advance what it has the file for based upon the scheduled hearing. Therefore, it cannot be argued that this is for the benefit of the Court. Certainly the attorneys are aware of their own file status, and they don't need those forms. Therefore, the only person or organization that would benefit from the forms is the Clerk of the Court. Since it is already his duty to docket these files, it seems to me it is a duplication of efforts and/or an additional burden that is unnecessary.

For the aforesaid reasons, I strongly oppose the Amendment to Rule 1.100 as it is currently framed.

Sincerely,

  
CRAIG A. LAPORTE

CAL/dla