

April 11, 2005

**VIA E-MAIL and FEDERAL EXPRESS**

The Honorable Thomas D. Hall  
Clerk of the Court  
Florida Supreme Court  
500 South Duval Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1927

Re: Comment to Proposed Changes to Florida Rule  
of Judicial Administration 2.170 - Case No.  
SC05-173

Dear Mr. Hall:

On behalf of the First Amendment Foundation (“FAF”), we submit this comment in opposition to the proposed changes in Fla. R. Jud. Admin. 2.170, governing cameras in the courtroom.

FAF is a public interest organization formed for the purpose of helping preserve and advance freedom of speech and of the press as provided in the U.S. Constitution and the Florida Constitution and acting as an advocate and defender of the public right of access to records and meetings of government. It represents more than 200 members, including most of Florida's daily newspapers, other media organizations, First Amendment and media law attorneys, students, private citizens, and public interest organizations.

Additional information about our organization and its officers and governing body can be obtained by visiting our website at <http://www.floridafaf.org/>.

April 11, 2005  
Page two

We apologize that this comment is out of time. However, Judge Isom has kindly agreed that I may represent to you that she has no objection to this late filing.

FAF previously submitted comments on an earlier version of this rule to Judge Webster. I understand that these comments were included in the committee's report to the Court and will not burden the file by repeating or copying these comments, which I believe are still pertinent and incorporate by reference.

We are interested in reiterating these concerns as well as bringing to the Court's attention two additional concerns.

First, the proposed rule would deny public access to video recordings made by security cameras in the courtroom. Since these recordings are made in the course of performing official business, we believe they are public records and that access to them may be denied only by a proper legislative exemption adopted in accordance with Art. I, § § 24(a)(c) of the Florida Constitution. At this stage in our inter-branch jurisprudence, it is not consistent with our understanding of the constitutional right of access that the Court could categorically exclude a set of public records from public view. In keeping with our view that camera access should be limited only on a case-by-case basis, I offer the gratuitous comment that Rule 2.051(c)(9) offers grounds for a case-specific order of sealer of such tapes when the elements of that rule are present. But we must urge the Court not to adopt a categorical "exemption" from the right of public access granted by Art. I, § 24(a), Fla. Const. See Art. I, § 24(c), Fla. Const.

Second, we are concerned that the proposed changes to the rule that would allow the trial court broad discretion to prohibit filming, photographing, or videographing of juror's faces is now expressly intended to overrule the case law of Florida as held in *WFTV, Inc. v. State*, 704 So. 2d 188 (Fla. 4<sup>th</sup> DCA 1997). Inasmuch as the majority opinion in this case is the highest law of the State of Florida and could be overruled only through the exercise of the Supreme Court's adjudicatory powers in a proper case or controversy laid before the Court in the course of determining the outcome

April 11, 2005  
Page three

of contested cases, we believe the Court lacks jurisdiction to adopt a rule overruling the holding in WFTV.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth herein, those we urged upon Judge Webster in our previous comment, and for the additional reasons set forth in the Media comment filed by Carol Jean LoCicero of Holland & Knight, we urge the Court to decline to adopt the proposed changes.

Very truly yours,

Jonathan D. Kaney Jr.  
General Counsel

cc: Honorable Claudia R. Isom  
13<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit  
800 East Twiggs Street, Suite 513  
Tampa, Florida 33602-3556

John F. Harkness, Jr.  
Executive Director  
The Florida Bar  
651 East Jefferson Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2300

---

<sup>1</sup> See Kogan and Waters, The Operation and Jurisdiction of the Florida Supreme Court, 18 Nova L. Rev. 1151 (1994) ("It is worth noting that by promulgating a rule, the Court does not vouch for its constitutionality. A court rule could thus be challenged in a future proceeding on any valid constitutional ground. This is because rules are issued as an administrative function of the Court, not as an adjudicatory function. For much the same reason, the act of promulgating a rule does not foreclose challenges that it contains "substantive" aspects and to that extent is invalid. Questions such as these can only be decided when affected parties bring an actual controversy for resolution").

April 11, 2005  
Page four

J. Craig Shaw  
Bar Staff Liaison  
Rules of Judicial Administration Committee  
The Florida Bar  
651 East Jefferson Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2300

Steven Patrick Combs  
Duvall County Courthouse  
330 East Bay Street, Room 222  
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

Carol Jean LoCicero  
Holland and Knight LLP  
100 North Tampa Street, Suite 4100  
Tampa, Florida 33602-3644