

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Judiciary currently has two dedicated sources of funding for information processing activities: the Court Technology Improvement Fund (P.L.2002, c.34) and the 21st Century Justice Improvement Fund (P.L.2014, c.31).
 - *Question:* Please provide a description of the purpose for each of these funds and how they differ. What upgrades have been completed since the implementation of the Court Technology Improvement Fund? What technology investments and upgrades are planned? What is the estimate cost and timetable for these projects?

RESPONSE

The Court Technology Improvement Fund (L. 2002, c. 34) is dedicated to the “development, establishment, operation, and maintenance of computerized court information systems in the Judiciary.” As the revenue source generally funding all strategic technology initiatives, the Judiciary has latitude in prioritizing and allocating these funds to a broad portfolio of projects. Both historically and currently, this fund supports initiatives in the Civil, Family, and Criminal Divisions, the Probation Division, the Appellate, Tax, and Supreme Courts, as well as numerous administrative systems, law enforcement systems, and attorney applications. In addition, revenue from this fund is allocated to help offset a growing structural deficit in base operational maintenance dollars delivering essential support to the Judiciary technology infrastructure.

Since this fund was established, the Judiciary has pursued and completed many strategic initiatives, including data center upgrades, network expansions, conversions of all legacy applications to a new database architecture, continued web-enabling of applications, development of a resilient disaster recovery infrastructure, along with dozens of new case management, administrative, and law enforcement applications services. Future investment in this area will focus on the ongoing modernization and enhancement of applications providing improved reliability and availability, faster processing, intuitive web-based interfaces, and expanded options for mobile access to court data.

The recently enacted 21st Century Justice Improvement Fund (L. 2014, c. 31) is specifically and exclusively dedicated to the “development, maintenance, and administration of a statewide digital eCourt information system.” As such, all revenue collected from this fund is strictly reserved for the current intensive eCourts development and implementation effort.

The establishment of the 21st Century Fund provides \$10 million per year toward the eCourts initiative. The main focus will be the development of a risk assessment instrument, case management component associated to the judicial release or detention decision, pretrial supervision module, and speedy trial element. Each of these will be built on the existing work and provide new functionality as the Judiciary continues its digital transformation using eCourts.

1. (cont'd)

- **Question:** What is the status of the fee increase authorized under P.L.2014, c.31? Please provide a list of the fee increases implemented under the statute including the original fees, new fees and increase for each fee. Does the Judiciary anticipate that it will collect the full amount estimated under P.L.2014, c.31? How have the various fee increases for the support of these funds affected court filings and anticipated revenues?

RESPONSE

On August 11, 2014, Governor Christie signed S-946 into law as L. 2014, c. 31. Sections 1 through 11 and section 20 of the law contain provisions regarding pretrial release and pretrial detention. Sections 12 through 19 of the new law authorize the Supreme Court to “revise or supplement filing fees and other statutory fees payable to the court” by Court Rule to fund a Pretrial Services Program, the development and maintenance of a digital e-Court system, and Legal Services of New Jersey.

The Court Rules were publicly announced and the Supreme Court held a public hearing. On October 31, 2014, the Supreme Court adopted new Court Rule 1:43 and amended Court Rule 8:12 (Tax Court fees) to create several new court fees and to revise existing fees to fund the implementation of the bail reform/pre-trial services legislation. In accordance with the new law, no single fee was increased by more than \$50. The new Court Rules took effect on November 17, 2014. The attached chart – “New Jersey Court Fees” – shows the original fees, the new fees, and the increase for each fee.

The new law anticipates that this fee increase will generate at least \$42.1 million: \$22 million to the Judiciary for the development, maintenance and administration of a Pretrial Services Program; \$10 million to the Judiciary for a digital e-court information system; and \$10.1 million to the Department of Treasury for distribution to Legal Services of New Jersey. The Judiciary is monitoring the revenue collected from the fee increases on a monthly basis. Current projections indicate that the Judiciary will likely meet the goal of collecting \$42.1 million from the new and revised fees. Below is a chart which shows the actual revenues collected from the fee increase through February 2015.

<u>21st Century Revenues</u>						
		November	December	January	February	FY15 YTD
21st Century Master	\$	757,800.50	3,245,969.50	3,078,179.50	3,365,000.00	\$ 10,446,949.50
PTS	\$	396,026.54	1,696,343.66	1,608,656.61	1,758,549.00	\$ 5,459,575.81
eCourts	\$	179,977.62	770,917.76	731,067.63	799,187.50	\$ 2,481,150.51
LSNJ	\$	181,796.34	778,708.08	738,455.26	807,263.50	\$ 2,506,223.18

Factoring in legal holidays and court recess, snow closures, system programming issues, and that the new fees took effect half way through the month, the November data reflects only about one full business week of collections under the new fee schedule. Likewise, December and January are traditionally low filing months, however, the Judiciary generated revenue slightly below the anticipated average. While February is also a traditionally low filing month, as well as a short month that included legal holidays and snow closures, collections increased. The Judiciary anticipates that monthly collections allocated to the 21st Century Fund will average \$3.5 million and yearly collections allocated to the 21st Century Fund will average \$42.1 million.

2. Pursuant to P.L.2014, c.31, the Judiciary is required to establish and maintain a Statewide Pretrial Services Program. Under the program, a risk assessment would be conducted on any person for whom a complaint-warrant is issued for an initial charge involving an indictable offense or disorderly persons offense within 48 hours of the person's commitment to jail, for the purpose of making recommendations to the court concerning an appropriate pretrial release determination. The Statewide Pretrial Services Program would also monitor persons released on court ordered conditions. The program is to become operational on January 1, 2017.
 - **Question:** What is the status of the Judiciary's preparation for the implementation of this program? Who will be conducting the risk assessments on these individuals? What type of training will be required for those who conduct these risk assessments?

RESPONSE

L. 2014, c. 31 was enacted on August 11, 2014. In the months since then, the Judiciary has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") with the Arnold Foundation, a national foundation that uses empirical data to drive reforms in the criminal justice field. The MOU allows the Judiciary to use the Arnold Foundation's risk assessment tool to assess the risk of criminal offenders and determine the appropriate levels of supervision. New Jersey data has been provided so that the Foundation's risk assessment can be validated for use in New Jersey.

Several Judiciary working groups have been established to review and determine staffing and operational needs and objectives. Areas these groups are examining include: technology, court rules, and policy and procedure. The working groups have received significant input from both national and other states' experts in the area of pretrial release.

The Judiciary will also be sending a delegation to meet with the Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts to observe the workings of their Pretrial Services Program and to benefit from their experience in implementing that program. We also will be planning a similar meeting with the Kentucky Administrative Office of the Courts. Both programs use the Arnold Foundation risk assessment tool.

The Judiciary's intent is to automate, to the extent possible, the assessment process. This will involve a complicated system redesign to allow the new applications to connect with the Judiciary's older legacy systems, such as Promis/Gavel, Municipal Court systems, and Probation systems. Work on programming requirements, screen designs, and process flows has begun. The Judiciary is also coordinating with the Attorney General's Office to establish an interface with their National Crime Information Center ("NCIC") and Live Scan systems.

The necessary and comprehensive restructuring of the criminal case management process and court rules will require cooperation among multiple stakeholders, and is likely to be a protracted process. The Judiciary working group is soliciting input from the Attorney General's Office and the Public Defender, as well as the private bar. Ultimately, the working group's report will be forwarded to the Criminal Practice Committee for review, and then to the Supreme Court for final approval.

Judiciary employees will conduct the risk assessments. Training on the risk assessment process will be required for both judges and staff. For assessment staff, training will encompass running the risk assessment, understanding the results, and making the release recommendation to the judge. Additional training for staff responsible for monitoring any defendants released with conditions will be

necessary. For judges, training on the shift to a risk-based release system from a resource-based release system will be critical to implementing the new law's objectives. Some training has commenced already and more is planned. The Judiciary anticipates receiving training assistance from the Arnold Foundation.

3. P.L.2014, c.31 increases fees to provide funding for the AOC to develop and administer a Statewide e-court program.

- **Question: What are the goals, objectives and status of the e-court program?**

RESPONSE

eCourts is a web based application that is designed to allow attorneys, in good standing, to electronically file documents with the courts. The objective of the eCourts initiative is the development of a digital model for the filing, case management, and retention of information associated with case processing and public interaction with the Judiciary. Through creation of a web-based window into the courts, the judiciary will transform how the citizens of the State are served. This initiative provides increased transparent access to the court, streamlines how the court is able to manage, store and retain information, and re-engineers the paper driven case processing models that were originally formulated in the 1980's and 1990's through our early adoption and development of statewide case management systems and are still in existence today.

- In 2014, the Judiciary developed the first module of the eCourts framework for the Criminal Division. This module allowed attorneys to eFile documents with the Judiciary. These documents are placed in an electronic case jacket and are available to Judges, court staff, and parties to the case. As of July 31, 2014, eCourts was implemented statewide for the electronic filing of Criminal Division motions. The next component of Criminal eCourts is the digitization of the criminal complaint ("CDR"). The Judiciary built the eCDR application, which creates 99% of complaints, warrants, and summons by Law Enforcement. In 2015, the Judiciary will complete and save a digital copy of the CDR to the Criminal eCourts Case Jacket and share associated data with appropriate parties.
- In 2009, the Judiciary developed the Judgment of Conviction ("JOC") application, which creates an electronic copy of the JOC. In 2014, the Judiciary built an interface to place that electronic copy in the Criminal eCourts Case Jacket. In 2015, the Judiciary will enhance the security available in the case jacket application enabling the sealing of cases and documents, which will provide the necessary security to expose documents from the Pre-Sentence Report system to appropriate parties. This functionality will be reused in similar applications in the Civil and Family Divisions.
- In 2015, the Judiciary began the development of the second major module on the eCourts framework. On February 9, 2015, eCourts became available to attorneys submitting Tax Court filings. This module was developed and implemented in five months and leveraged much of the work completed during the design of Criminal Division module. The Judiciary expects this work in the Tax Court will serve as the basis for the Civil Division module, which is expected to begin in late 2015.
- In 2015, the Judiciary completed the third major module of eCourts. This module allows mental health providers to eFile reports to the Probation Division. The Judiciary also expects to develop a violation of probation module this year.

- In 2014, the Judiciary deployed a reengineered version of the Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”) application (“eTRO”). This new version is available in seventeen counties; statewide rollout will be completed this summer. In mid-2015, the Judiciary expects to complete the fourth major module in the eCourts framework. This module will provide an electronic case jacket for the Family Division. This case jacket will be populated by documents from the eTRO system and documents uploaded manually by the Family Division.

While thousands of electronic filings by attorneys statewide have already been processed, plans are underway for full implementation of eCourts in all trial court divisions, including expansion to the Civil and Family Divisions. Completion of this effort will bring New Jersey Superior Court into the digital age.

4. The FY 2016 budget anticipated that court fee collections will total \$54.63 million in FY 2016, \$804,000 less than the amount collected in FY 2015 and \$1.667 million less than the amount collected in FY 2014 (Budget page C-7).

- **Question: What are the reasons for the continuing decrease in court fee collections? Does the Judiciary believe this trend will continue beyond FY 2016?**

RESPONSE

The decline in expected collections of court fees is consistent with recent filing volume. Over the past three years, the Judiciary has experienced a reduction in court filings of approximately 1.5%. The largest declines occurred in 2012 and 2013. The decline has been in large part due to the downturn in the economy as a result of the 2008 recession, and has in turn affected the fee revenues. In 2014 and early 2015, filing volume has begun to stabilize.

It is important to note that the FY 2016 budget anticipated court fee revenue decline does not impact the Judiciary’s dedicated funds, including the Court Technology Improvement Fund (L. 2002, c. 34) and the 21st Century Justice Improvement Fund (L. 2014, c. 31). Current projections indicate that the Judiciary will likely meet its goal of collecting \$42.1 million from the new and revised fees as established in L. 2014, c. 31.

The budget projections for FY 2016 referenced in Budget page C-7 were submitted prior to the implementation of the new fee schedule in accordance with L. 2014, c. 31 and pursuant to Rule 1:43. Historically, an increase in court filing fees results in a 2.5% decrease in filings. Since the implementation of the new fee schedule, filings in Civil and Special Civil Part have decreased consistent with that past experience and as expected.

The Judiciary anticipates that the revenue collected from court filing fees will be affected in 2017, as bail reform is implemented. The \$600,000 annually collected as Bail Discharge fees will generate only a fraction of the current amount after pretrial services has been implemented.

5. The FY 2016 budget recommends an additional \$8.5 million for the expanded Drug Court program. The recommendation would provide an additional \$3.35 million for treatment services and \$5.136 million for the court's operating costs. P.L.2012, c.23 modified the criteria for admission into the drug court program, to allow more persons to be eligible and have access to the program and authorized a phased-in mandatory drug court program. No additional funding is recommended for Drug Court Judgeships.
- **Question:** What is the status of the implementation of mandatory drug court? In which counties is mandatory drug court operating? To which counties will the program be expanded next? How has the implementation of mandatory drug court participation affected the program's successful completion rate? To date, has funding been sufficient for the effective operation of the program?

RESPONSE

Currently, six vicinages are operating mandatory drug courts in the state. Ocean, Hudson, and Somerset/Warren/Hunterdon Vicinages began operating on July 1, 2013. Passaic, Mercer, and Atlantic/Cape May Vicinages began operating July 1, 2014. On July 1, 2015, Bergen, Burlington, and Monmouth Vicinages will begin operating the mandatory drug court program. Bergen, Burlington, and Monmouth Vicinages are in the process of interviewing and hiring the necessary staff.

As of March 1, 2015, 111 defendants have been sentenced under the mandatory provisions of the drug court program. Because the mandatory drug court program is under two years old, the impact, if any, on the program's successful completion, which is typically at least 24 months from sentencing to graduation, is not ascertainable. However, with regard to the retention rate of mandatory participants in the program as compared with voluntary participants, for the past 12 months (March 1, 2014 through February 28, 2015) the mandatory participant retention rate has been 90.2%, while voluntary participate retention has been 79.9%. The Judiciary will continue to track voluntary and mandatory admissions into the program to measure any impact on retention and graduation.

With regard to funding for drug court, the Judiciary is committed to sustaining a quality drug court program that effectively intervenes in the life of drug addicted offenders to help them become productive, self-supporting, drug-free citizens. In fiscal year 2014, the program did not receive the amount of money requested for the operation of the program. It should be noted that in fiscal year 2015, the proposed budget does include the amount requested. The Judiciary will continue to work closely with our drug court partners in the Department of Human Services, Division of Mental Health and Addiction Services.

6. According to the AOC, there are currently 50 Superior Court vacancies with another 10 anticipated by the end of 2015. In addition, a total of 15 of the current vacancies are located in Essex County.
- *Question:* What steps has the Judiciary taken to compensate for the number of Superior Court vacancies? Are costs incurred in taking these steps greater than the savings realized from vacant judgeships? What is the effect of these vacancies on court backlogs in the affected vicinages?

RESPONSE

In managing the number of Superior Court vacancies, the Judiciary relies significantly on the hard work and dedication of its judges who work long hours and carry substantial caseloads. There are no monetary costs associated with this reliance. In addition, the Judiciary utilizes recall judges, who provide additional and vital assistance in hearing and moving cases to help ensure the timely resolution of matters. Costs incurred in taking steps to compensate for the number of vacancies have not exceeded the total salary amount of the open judgeships.

Backlog refers to cases that remain open beyond the self-imposed time goals that the Judiciary has established for each case type. The Judiciary has implemented backlog standards for virtually every case type and strives to resolve as many cases as possible within these time frames. When multicounty litigation cases (formerly "mass tort") are excluded, the overall backlog had a slight reduction from 29,408 cases in February 2013 to 29,367 cases in February 2015.

Seven vicinages carried at least three judicial vacancies for at least six months in the last two years, and had some difficulty keeping up with the caseload volume. Those seven vicinages had a total backlog increase of 7.0 percent from 15,300 cases in February 2013 to 16,376 cases in February 2015. The other eight vicinages had a total backlog decrease of 7.9 percent from 14,108 cases in February 2013 to 12,991 cases in February 2015.

7. The Judiciary currently utilizes recall judges, who are retired judges who make themselves available for judicial services on a per diem basis. According to the Judiciary, “recall judges provide stability and continuity for the work of the Judiciary by accepting assignments for special projects and programs, so that judges on permanent assignment are not diverted from their primary responsibilities.”
- *Question:* Are recall judges used to fill the gaps left by Superior Court vacancies? How have these vacancies affected the utilization of recall judges? How many judges are currently available for recall? Does the Judiciary have enough recall judges to address the need for judicial services?

RESPONSE

The best use of resources in the Judiciary is to assign a full complement of fulltime judges to preside over the adjudication and case management of the more than 900,000 trial court cases. However, in eighteen of the last twenty-four months, the total number of judicial vacancies was greater than 50 positions. During this period, the Judiciary was able to rely on highly experienced retired judges working part-time on recall to accomplish the duties of approximately twenty fulltime judges in the trial courts. Most of the recall judges were assigned to counties with the greatest numbers of vacancies. Counties that had at least three vacancies during this period accounted for more than two-thirds of the recall judge time. Currently the Judiciary has 75 recall judges assigned who typically work an average of two to three days per week.

The Judiciary expects that it will always need to rely on the use of a small number of recall judges to help fill the gaps created by vacancies and to provide assistance in specialized areas. Recall judges have provided that essential assistance so that the Courts could continue to provide timely resolutions. However, the Judiciary’s regular work depends on the day-to-day, year-round effort that fulltime judges provide. As the Judiciary looks forward to the day when more vacancies are filled and fewer recall judges are needed, it continues to be grateful for the extraordinary help that so many dedicated retired judges provide.

8. Effective January 1, 2015, the Judiciary began accepting cases into its new Complex Business Litigation program, which was established as a result of the recommendations of the Chief Justice's Working Group on Business Litigation.

- *Question:* Why was the program established? Please provide a description of the program. What are the criteria for acceptance into the program? Which judges participate in the program and what training do they receive? What, if any, has been the public response to the program?

RESPONSE

In the fall of 2013, Chief Justice Stuart Rabner created the "Working Group on Business Litigation" to address the particularized needs of the parties in business related litigation and to review current Judiciary programs to measure their effectiveness. The Working Group presented recommendations to the Supreme Court to expand a statewide pilot program in Bergen and Essex counties for complex business litigation. The Supreme Court approved the Working Group's recommendations and implemented the Complex Business Litigation Program ("CBLP") for the handling of complex business, commercial, and construction cases. The CBLP became effective on January 1, 2015.

A case is eligible for the CBLP if the following criteria are met:

- **Threshold Damages Amount** – The amount in controversy must be at least \$200,000 for inclusion in the CBLP, unless the court determines in a particular situation that a case with a lesser amount in controversy is appropriate for inclusion; and
- **The matter meets one of the following definitions:**

Complex Commercial: Defined as claims by, against, and among parties that arise out of business or commercial transactions and involve parties' exposure to potentially significant damage awards; or where the business or commercial claim involves complex factual or legal issues; a large number of separately represented parties; potential numerous pre-trial motions raising difficult or novel legal issues; case management of a large number of lay and expert witnesses or a substantial amount of documentary evidence (including electronically stored information); substantial time required to complete the trial; significant interpretation of a business or commercial statute; or involves other contentions of a complex business – commercial nature.

Complex Construction: Defined as claims by, against, and among owners, contractors, subcontractors, fabricators and installers, architects, engineers, design and construction consultants, and other similar parties associated with a construction project that involves parties' exposure to potentially significant damage awards because of claimed design and construction defects, or facility delivery delay claims or where the construction claim involves complex factual or legal issues; a large number of separately represented parties; potential numerous pre-trial motions raising difficult or novel legal issues; case management of a large number of lay and expert witnesses or a substantial amount of documentary evidence (including electronically stored information); substantial time required to complete the trial. Complex

construction does not include construction and professional payment and billing claims, change order claims, wrongful termination, *quantum merit*, construction lien, or mechanics lien claims, unless associated with a complex construction claim as herein described.

Other Suitable Actions: Actions to establish a constructive trust or impose an equitable lien to satisfy damages are also cognizable in the Complex Business Litigation Program, as are cases primarily seeking legal relief in which ancillary injunctive relief is sought.

The CBLP does not include matters that are handled by the General Equity part of the Superior Court, Chancery Division, or matters primarily involving consumers, labor organizations, personal injury, or condemnation, or cases in which the government is a party.

Parties will self-designate cases they believe meet the above criteria. The Assignment Judge or his/her designee may initially conduct a review of the case to determine if it is appropriate for the CBLP. The CBLP judge may also review actions presumptively assigned to the CBLP to determine if the case is appropriate for inclusion. If, after review, a judge determines that the complex nature of the action or the threshold damages claim amount is not established, the case may be removed from the CBLP. Cases removed from the CBLP will be reassigned to the appropriate track for case management.

Parties may file a motion with the CBLP judge for inclusion in the program where the amount in controversy is less than \$200,000. Parties may also move for removal from the CBLP on the grounds that the action does not meet the eligibility criteria.

The Assignment Judge in each vicinage has designated at least one judge with a business background or familiarity with complex business issues, or a judge interested in developing expertise in these areas, to oversee all complex business litigation. At present there are 16 judges assigned to handle cases in the CBLP. The judges assigned to the CBLP receive training in substantive areas of law as well as case and trial management. The judges initially received three full days of training as well as additional training sessions at a recent judicial education conference. The CBLP judges will continue to receive specialized training over time to further hone their knowledge and skills.

Initial indications are that the business community is pleased with the CBLP.

9. The Chief Justice has recently formed the Supreme Court Ad Hoc Committee on Domestic Violence.

- *Question:* What is the purpose of this committee? What is the status of the committee's efforts to date?

RESPONSE

The Chief Justice recently formed the Supreme Court Ad Hoc Committee on Domestic Violence to objectively review how our state handles domestic violence matters. The Committee is to serve as a forum for stakeholders to conduct an in-depth review of our current domestic violence laws and policies, including but not limited to: the interaction of the municipal and Superior Courts in handling domestic violence matters, the level and degree of domestic violence offenses, the resources available to victims of domestic violence, and the education and training opportunities available to all stakeholders.

The Chief Justice asked Cumberland/Gloucester/Salem Vicinage Assignment Judge Georgia M. Curio to chair the Committee. Committee membership includes a cross-section of system stakeholders, including members of the private bar, judges, prosecutors (both county and municipal), public defenders (both state and municipal), members of the Legislature, a representative from the Governor's office, representatives from leading domestic violence advocacy groups, academics specializing in domestic violence, and Judiciary managers with specialized knowledge and experience.

The Committee's first meeting was held on March 2, 2015. At that meeting, subcommittees were formed to begin addressing specific issues. The broader Committee and its subcommittees will meet regularly. It is anticipated that a final report will be submitted to the Supreme Court by the end of the year.

10. The AOC has been operating a Guardianship Monitoring initiative. Under the program the court uses volunteer court-appointed legal guardians to make decisions for incapacitated people about personal and medical care, meals, transportation, and even where a person lives. Guardians control assets, manage budgets, pay debts, and make all financial and investment decisions for the people they assist.
- **Question:** Please provide an update on the program, including number of persons assisted and the number of persons serving as legal guardians. How does the Judiciary evaluate whether the initiative is adequately serving the public interest?

RESPONSE

The New Jersey Judiciary Guardianship Monitoring Program (“GMP”) is a statewide volunteer-based court program established to monitor guardians in their handling of the affairs of incapacitated individuals. The GMP utilizes volunteers to monitor guardianship cases to ensure that court-appointed legal guardians are performing their duties related to the well-being and financial affairs of incapacitated individuals appropriately. The goal of the GMP is to reduce the potential for abuse, neglect, and exploitation of incapacitated individuals by their guardians. The program is committed to helping ensure that these vulnerable members of society are treated with dignity and respect, while also assisting guardians in performing their sometimes difficult role.

Four Program Coordinators at the Administrative Office of the Courts oversee the GMP statewide. The GMP was implemented in all twenty-one counties as of July 1, 2014. As of March 2015, 67 individuals are serving as GMP volunteers, and recruitment is ongoing. GMP volunteers are responsible for two functions. First, volunteers enter information extracted from guardianship case files into the Judiciary’s new Guardianship Monitoring System (“GMS”) database. Second, volunteers use a standardized report review tool within GMS to review required periodic reports submitted by guardians regarding the well-being and financial affairs of incapacitated persons.

The Judiciary uses several measures to evaluate the GMP’s service of the public interest. First, the Judiciary tracks the number of guardianship cases entered into GMS and the number of periodic reports reviewed. Prior to the inception of the GMP, guardianship case records had been maintained only at the county level. As a result, statewide data related to guardianships was unavailable. Similarly, the review of periodic reports was uneven. Since the launch of the GMP, volunteers have entered data related to over 4,100 guardianship cases into the GMS database, and have reviewed over 2,300 periodic reports submitted by guardians.

Second, the GMP has begun to provide confidential reports to Superior Court, Chancery Division, Probate Part Judges related to cases of concern. The reports detail the GMP’s findings and make recommendations to the court as to further action to be taken in such cases. Going forward, the GMP will continue to issue reports related to cases of concern, and will track the number and types of cases in which reports are issued.

Third, the GMP has begun to evaluate guardians’ compliance with periodic reporting requirements and will take steps to increase compliance. These measures will include communication with guardians regarding their reporting requirements and development of a comprehensive statewide training program for guardians as to their responsibilities. To that end, in April 2014 the Supreme Court adopted revised

guardian reporting forms, accompanied by detailed instructions designed to simplify reporting for most guardians, and to ensure reporting of necessary information in guardianships with substantial assets or other complexity.

Fourth, the GMP has provided training to Probate Part Judges in an effort to develop consistency and ensure effective protections of incapacitated individuals in guardianship matters.

11. Recently, the Judiciary has begun implementing various technology-based services to assist jurors such as a mobile app for smart phones and text alerts.

- **Question:** Please provide a description of these initiatives. What other initiatives does the Judiciary anticipate that it will implement? Is there an anticipated release date for these services? Does the Judiciary use social media to disseminate information to the public?

RESPONSE

The Judiciary developed several mobile applications to assist individuals interacting with the Judiciary. The first – NJ Juror – provides juror information, juror parking and courthouse directions, court phone numbers, places to eat, and links to informational documents and video resources for jurors. A separate initiative provides jurors with a mechanism to request text and email alerts about their jury service. The alerts provide a reminder of upcoming duty, notify the individual of their jury status, and alert jurors when that status changes due to weather events. To date, the Judiciary has sent almost 1.2 million texts to jurors. Feedback from the juror application led to development of an attorney version, which provides similar information, and includes notices to the bar, rules of evidence, rules of court, and other attorney-specific information.

The Judiciary is continues to develop applications that leverage the data contained in our case management applications. We expect to develop a mobile-device application that will meet the requirements of eCourts. The eCourts Case Jacket and inquiry applications will follow the rollout of eCourts Civil in 2016. Our goal is to provide timely information to all devices.

The New Jersey Judiciary was one of the first court systems in the nation to use social media to communicate the work of the courts to the public. The Judiciary uses Facebook, YouTube, SMS, Twitter, and RSS feeds. The Judiciary Facebook group, “New Jersey Courts,” is open to anyone who wants to join. Postings include press releases, event photos, and other items that help educate the public about the work that is being done in the courts. The Facebook page is not used to disseminate time-sensitive information, such as emergency court closings or the release of court opinions. The Judiciary uses Twitter to disseminate news releases, emergency court closings, Advisory Committee on Judicial Conduct (“ACJC”) updates, Supreme Court opinion announcements, and Notices to the Bar. The Judiciary YouTube channel hosts short videos about court events, programs, and services that are designed to educate and inform the public.

12. Foreclosures have been a continuing problem in New Jersey in recent years.

- **Question:** What is the current status of foreclosures in New Jersey? Are foreclosure filings still increasing at this time, have they leveled off, or have they begun to decrease? How many foreclosures are pending? How has the AOC’s foreclosure mediation program affected the foreclosure process in New Jersey and the case backlog?

RESPONSE

New foreclosure filings reached their high water mark to date in 2009-2010, with more than 60,000 new actions filed. As a result of foreclosure document preparation and filing irregularities (“robo-signing”), the Judiciary implemented an Omnibus Order to Show Cause process to aid plaintiffs in complying with regulatory noticing requirements. Then, as the lender-servicers worked to conform their practices to reflect the new safeguards used to ensure the integrity of the foreclosure process, the number of new foreclosure actions dramatically decreased in 2011 and 2012. That downturn in filings has ended. The number of new filings in 2013 marked a dramatic increase of more than 100% from the year prior. In 2014, there was a further 29% increase in new foreclosure filings. As homeowners continue to default on loan modifications, it is anticipated that new foreclosure actions will continue to steadily increase over the next few years, returning to the levels reflected in 2010.

Court Year	Filings
2010	63,993
2011	33,873
2012	19,267
2013	42,035
2014	54,322
2015 (anticipated)	56,000

To respond to the growing number of new foreclosures, the Judiciary has implemented measures to provide efficiencies and eliminate redundancies. Those measures include unification of the Foreclosure Processing Services group and the Office of Foreclosure as one unit under the direction of the Clerk of the Superior Court, dismissal of stale cases for lack of prosecution pursuant to Rule 4:64-8, training and education seminars in foreclosure practice and pleadings, and adjusting staffing models to adequately meet the needs of the court, Superior Court Clerk’s Office, and the public. The Court is promptly addressing submitted responsive pleadings immediately after the expiration of motion periods.

The Judiciary receives approximately 4,800 new complaints each month. There are currently 81,698 active pending foreclosure cases filed with the Judiciary as of February 2015. 67,390 of the pending cases were filed within the past 24 months. Thus, the remaining 14,308 are aged greater than two years and it is anticipated that there are procedural lending practices that preclude them from moving forward in the judicial process. It is important to note that more than 91,000 stale cases have been dismissed for lack of prosecution since December of 2012, demonstrating the Judiciary’s commitment to moving cases in foreclosure forward to disposition. Contrary to reports in the media, the judicial time frame for a foreclosure matter – that is, from the filing of the complaint through the entry of judgment – is between 6 and 12 months (or 180 and 365 days). This is but a fraction of the overall time reported by the media and corporations like Realty Trac.

Homeowners electing to participate in mediation within the first 60 days after the complaint has been filed is still relatively low. This may be attributed to the loss mitigation efforts required by the Consumer

The Judiciary

FY 2015-2016

Financial Protection Bureau (“CFPB”). For those homeowners who elect mediation, the overall process tends to be effective, resulting in loan modifications or an agreed upon surrender of the premises.

New Jersey Court Filing Fees

All Courts	Current Fee ¹	Prior Fee ²	Increase ³
Affixing the seal of the court to any document (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-20; Rule 1:43)	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
Certified Copy (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-19; Rule 1:43)	\$15.00	\$5.00	\$10.00
Copies, Letter Size, per page (N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(b))	\$0.05	\$0.05	\$0.00
Copies, Legal Size, per page (N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(b))	\$0.07	\$0.07	\$0.00
Exemplification (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-20; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$5.00	\$45.00
Triple Exemplification (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-20; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$10.00	\$40.00
Non-Party Notice of Appearance (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)			
Civil Part and Superior Court Clerk's Office	\$50.00	No Fee	\$50.00
Special Civil Part	\$30.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Family- Dissolution and Non-Dissolution (effective 1/16/15)	\$50.00	No Fee	\$50.00
Notice of Appeal (Trial Court Copy) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-20; Rule 1:43)	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$0.00
Signing and Issuing Subpoena (Trial Courts) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$5.00	\$45.00
Subpoena with Seal of the Court (Trial Courts) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$60.00	\$10.00	\$50.00
Recording Instruments not otherwise provided for (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Substitutions of Attorney			
Civil Part and Superior Court Clerk's Office	\$35.00	No Fee	\$35.00
Special Civil Part (effective 1/16/15)	\$35.00	No Fee	\$35.00
Family- Dissolution and Non-Dissolution (effective 1/16/15)	\$35.00	No Fee	\$35.00
Filing by a State of New Jersey Agency (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-22)	No Fee	No Fee	\$0.00

¹ Throughout this document "Current Fee" reflects Court Rule 1:43 ("Filing and Other Fees Established Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2B:1-7") schedule of filing fees and other fees payable to the court that were revised or established as authorized by N.J.S.A. 2B:1-7 (L. 2014, c. 31, § 12), effective November 17, 2014. The New Jersey Court filing fees are available at <http://www.judiciary.state.nj.us/notices/2015/n150227a.pdf>

² Throughout this document "Prior Fee" reflects the filing fees and other fees payable to the court that were in effect prior to November 17, 2014, and can be found in the New Jersey statutes. N.J.S.A. 22A:2-1, -5, -6, -7, -12, -13, -19, -20, -22, -27, -29, -37.1, -37.2; N.J.S.A. 22A:5-1; N.J.S.A. 2C:36A-1D; N.J.S.A. 2C:43-12, -13; N.J.S.A. 19:29-1.

³ Throughout this document "Increase" reflects the difference between the "Current Fee" and the "Prior Fee."

Supreme Court	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
Notice of appeal, notice of cross-appeal, notice of petition for certification, notice of cross-petition for certification, notice of petition for review (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-1; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
First paper in any motion, petition or application (including an order) not in a pending cause or after judgment is entered (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-1; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Deposit for costs (Rule 2:12-5; Rule 2:5-2)	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$0.00
Superior Court, Appellate Division	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
Notice of appeal, notice of cross-appeal (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-1; N.J.S.A. 22A:2-5; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
First paper in any motion, petition or application (including an order) not in a pending cause or after judgment is entered (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-1; N.J.S.A. 22A:2-5; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Deposit for costs (Rule 2:5-2)	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$0.00
Superior Court, Clerk's Office	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
Recording Money Judgment as a Lien in the Civil Judgment and Order Docket (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$15.00	\$20.00
Recording of Foreign Judgment (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-29; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$15.00	\$20.00
Satisfaction of Judgment or other lien (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$35.00	\$15.00
Recording assignment, subordination, cancellation, postponement, or release of judgment (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Judgment by Confession (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$35.00	\$15.00
Transcript of Judgment (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-29; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$7.50	\$27.50
Issuing or recording executions (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$5.00	\$45.00
Issuing or recording any other documents (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Recognizance of civil bail (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7)	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$0.00
Filing all papers related to civil bail (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$30.00	\$5.00	\$25.00
Certificate by the Clerk with Seal of Court (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-20; Rule 1:43)	\$10.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
Document with Certification (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-19; Rule 1:43)	\$15.00	\$5.00 for first five	\$10.00

Certified Document with Seal of Court (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-19; Rule 1:43)	\$25.00	pages, \$ 0.75 for each additional \$5.00 for first five pages, \$ 0.75 for each additional	\$20.00
--	---------	---	---------

Superior Court, Probation Division	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
---	--------------------	------------------	-----------------

Probation Out-of-State Supervision Monthly Fee (Rule 1:43)	\$25.00 per month	No Fee	\$25.00
--	-------------------	--------	---------

Superior Court, Chancery Division, Family Part	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
---	--------------------	------------------	-----------------

Complaint (first paper) in divorce actions or actions for dissolution of a civil union or domestic partnership (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12; Rule 1:43)	\$300.00	\$250.00	\$50.00
Parent Education Registration (N.J.S.A. 2A:34-12.2)	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$0.00
First Responsive Pleading (Dissolution) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12; Rule 1:43)	\$175.00	\$135.00	\$40.00
Motion (Dissolution) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Order to Show Cause (Dissolution) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Motion or Order to Show Cause (Non-Dissolution)	No Fee	No Fee	\$0.00
Post-disposition Application (Non-Dissolution) (Rule 1:43)	\$25.00	No Fee	\$25.00
Writ of Execution (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7)	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$0.00
Warrant of Satisfaction (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7)	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$0.00
Application for Child Support Services (45 CFR 303.2 and N.J.A.C. 10:110-7.1)	\$6.00	\$6.00	\$0.00

Superior Court, Chancery Division, General Equity	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
--	--------------------	------------------	-----------------

Complaint (first paper) in all actions and proceedings (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12 and -13; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
Receivership and partition (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
Answer, Notice of Appearance (first paper) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12 and -13; Rule 1:43)	\$175.00	\$135.00	\$40.00
Cross Claim, Counterclaim, or Third Party Complaint (Rule 1:43)	\$75.00	\$65.00	\$10.00
Amended Answer Containing New Relief (Rule 1:43)	\$75.00	\$65.00	\$10.00
Motion (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12 and -13; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00

Order to Show Cause (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12 and -13; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Writ (Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	No Fee	\$50.00
Assignment (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-12 and -13; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Warrant of Satisfaction (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-20; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$35.00	\$15.00
Clerk's Certificate of Master's Appointment (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-20; Rule 1:43)	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$0.00
All other papers and services (minimum) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-20; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00

Superior Court, Law Division, Criminal Part	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
Expungement Application (N.J.S.A. 2C:52-29; 2-25; Rule 1:43)	\$75.00	\$52.50	\$22.50
Permit to Carry Handgun (N.J.S.A. 2C:58-4; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$20.00	\$30.00
Municipal Court Appeal (N.J.S.A. 22A: 2-27; Rule 1:43)	\$100.00	\$75.00	\$25.00
Appeal of denial of permit to purchase handgun or firearms purchaser ID Card (Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	No Fee	\$50.00
Pretrial Intervention (PTI) Application (N.J.S.A. 2C:43-12g and -13)	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$0.00
Conditional Discharge (CD) Application (Municipal and Criminal) (N.J.S.A. 2C:36A-1d)	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$0.00
Conditional Dismissal Application (Municipal and Criminal) (N.J.S.A. 2C:36A-1d)	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$0.00
Bail, Application to Post or Discharge (N.J.S.A. 22A: 2-29; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00

Superior Court, Law Division, Civil Part	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
Complaint (first paper by plaintiff), including in Multicounty litigation (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-6; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
Complaint Contesting Election (N.J.S.A. 19:29-2; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
Appeal to Law Division (Civil Part) from Inferior Court or Tribunal (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-27; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
Answer or First paper of any person other than the plaintiff, Motion (first paper), including in Multicounty litigation (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-6; Rule 1:43)	\$175.00	\$135.00	\$40.00
Cross Claim, Counterclaim, Claim of Contribution or Third Party Complaint (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-6; Rule 1:43)	\$75.00	\$65.00	\$10.00
Amended Answer or Amended Complaint Containing New Relief (Rule 1:43)	\$75.00	\$65.00	\$10.00
Transfer Case from Superior Court (Civil Part only) to Special Civil Part (Rule 6:4-1(f))	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$0.00
Motion, including in Multicounty litigation (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-6; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Petition in a Pending Action (Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00

Order to Show Cause (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-6; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
First paper in any motion, petition or application not in a pending action or proceeding or if made after dismissal or judgment entered (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Petition for Discovery not in a Pending Action (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Withdrawal of money deposited in court (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30 to 40	\$20 to 30
Security Deposit for Cost (per Defendant or as Order Reads)	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$0.00
Judgment on bond and warrant (in lieu of the fee required by Section 22A:2-6)	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$0.00
Restoration fee for failure to make discovery (Rule 4:23-5)			
Within 30 days of entry of order of dismissal	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$0.00
Beyond 30 days of entry of order of dismissal	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$0.00
Notice of Application for Wage Execution (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$30.00	\$20.00
Writ (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$5.00	\$45.00
Assignment of Judgment (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Warrant to Satisfy Judgment (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$35.00	\$15.00
Warrant for Arrest (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-7; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Trial De Novo (N.J.S.A. 2A:23A-27; Rule 4:21A-6(c))	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$0.00

Superior Court, Law Division, Special Civil Part	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
Complaint, small claim (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)			
One defendant	\$35.00	\$15.00	\$20.00
Each additional defendant	\$5.00	\$2.00	\$3.00
Counterclaim, small claim (Rule 1:43)	\$30.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Complaint, tenancy (plus mileage) ⁴ (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)			
One defendant	\$50.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
Each additional defendant	\$5.00	\$2.00	\$3.00
Complaint/initial pleading containing counterclaim, cross-claim or third-party complaint in DC actions: (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43) <i>Where the amount exceeds the small claims monetary limit</i>			
One defendant	\$75.00	\$50.00	\$25.00

⁴ Mileage fees of court officer equal the round trip cost by the most direct route to and from the location of the court that issued the document being served or executed, at the same rate as set by the State for other State employees, rounded up to the nearest dollar.

Each additional defendant <i>Where the amount does not exceed the small claims monetary limit</i>	\$5.00	\$2.00	\$3.00
One defendant	\$50.00	\$32.00	\$18.00
Each additional defendant	\$5.00	\$2.00	\$3.00
Appearance or answer to DC complaint or third party complaint (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$30.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Service of process, summons by mail (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1)			
Each defendant	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$0.00
At place of business or employment with postal instructions to deliver to addressee only, additional fee	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$0.00
Reservice of summons by mail, Each defendant (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1)	\$7.00	\$3.00	\$4.00
Reservice of summons or other original process by court officer (plus mileage), (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1)			
One defendant	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$0.00
Each additional defendant	\$5.00	\$2.00	\$3.00
Substituted service of process on NJ Motor Vehicle Commission (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1)	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$0.00
Plus postage	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$0.00
Warrant of removal (plus mileage) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1, Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$15.00	\$20.00
Warrant for arrest, commitment or writ of capias ad respondendum, each defendant (plus mileage) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$15.00	\$20.00
Wage execution (plus mileage) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Writ of execution or an order in the nature of execution (plus mileage) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Wage execution by mail to a federal agency, additional fee (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.2)	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$0.00
Writ of replevin or attachment issued subsequent to summons (plus mileage) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Writ of attachment and making inventory (plus mileage) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Writ of possession (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Writ and summons in replevin, taking bond and any inventory (plus mileage) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	\$5.00	\$30.00
Each additional defendant	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$0.00
Serving order for possession in replevin (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1)	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$0.00
Advertising property under execution or any order (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$10.00	\$40.00
Selling property under execution or any order (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$10.00	\$40.00
On every dollar collected on execution, writ of attachment, or any order (commission to the Court Officer -- <u>not</u> paid to the court)	\$0.10	\$0.10	\$0.00
Jury of six persons (DC or Small Claim) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$100.00	\$50.00	\$50.00

Motion or Order to Show Cause (DC) (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$25.00	No Fee	\$25.00
Exemplified copy of judgment (N.J.S.A. 22A:2-37.1; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$5.00 for first two pages \$1.00 each additional page	\$45.00
Restoration fee for failure to make discovery (Rule 6:4-6)			
Within 30 days of entry of order of dismissal	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$0.00
Beyond 30 days of entry of order of dismissal	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$0.00
Assignment of judgment (not an allowable taxed cost) (Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	No Fee	\$35.00
Warrant to Satisfy with docketed judgment (not an allowable taxed cost) (Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	No Fee	\$50.00
Warrant to Satisfy without docketed judgment (not an allowable taxed cost) (Rule 1:43)	\$35.00	No Fee	\$35.00

Tax Court	Current Fee	Prior Fee	Increase
<u>Non-Small Claims/Regular Local Property and State Taxes</u>			
Complaint for one parcel/condo or one state tax type (N.J.S.A. 22A:5-1(a); Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
Counterclaim for one parcel/condo or one state tax type (Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$250.00	\$200.00	\$50.00
Each additional parcel/condo or state tax type for complaint (Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	No Fee	\$50.00
Each additional parcel/condo or state tax type for counterclaim (Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	No Fee	\$50.00
<u>Small Claims Local Property and State Taxes</u>			
Complaint for one parcel/condo or one state tax type (Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$35.00	\$15.00
Complaint, where the sole issue is eligibility for homestead credit, rebate or refund, or for a senior citizen's or veteran's exemption or deduction (Rule 8:12)	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee
Counterclaim for one parcel/condo or one state tax type (Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	\$35.00	\$15.00
Each additional parcel/condo or state tax for complaint (Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$10.00	No Fee	\$10.00
Each additional parcel/condo or state tax type for counterclaim (Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$10.00	No Fee	\$10.00
<u>Motion -- Local Property and State Taxes</u>			
Motion for non-small claims (Rule 8:12; Rule 1:43)	\$50.00	No Fee	\$50.00
Motion for small claims	No Fee	No Fee	No Fee