

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

- - - - - X  
DALE G. BECKER, :  
Petitioner :  
v. : No. 00-6374  
BETTY MONTGOMERY, ATTORNEY :  
GENERAL OF OHIO, ET AL. :  
- - - - - X

Washington, D.C.  
Monday, April 16, 2001

The above-entitled matter came on for oral  
argument before the Supreme Court of the United States at  
10:02 a.m.  
APPEARANCES:  
JEFFREY S. SUTTON, ESQ., Columbus, Ohio; on behalf of  
the Petitioner.  
STEWART A. BAKER, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; invited to brief  
and argue as amicus curiae in support of judgment  
below.

1	C O N T E N T S	
2		PAGE
3	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
4	JEFFREY S. SUTTON, ESQ.	
5	On behalf of the Petitioner	3
6	STEWART A. BAKER, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Respondent	27
8	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	JEFFREY S. SUTTON, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Petitioner	48
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

(10:02 a.m.)

CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST: We'll hear argument  
now in No.00-6374, Dale Becker v. Betty Montgomery.

Mr. Sutton.

ORAL ARGUMENT OF JEFFREY S. SUTTON  
ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

MR. SUTTON: Thank you, Mr. Chief Justice, and  
may it please the Court:

There are two arguments that I would like to  
press this morning. The first is that a timely notice of  
appeal will never be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction  
solely because it lacks a signature. The second is an  
alternative argument, and that's that a typewritten  
signature would suffice to meet any such requirement.

Let me start with the sixth circuit's review of  
this particular case. In their view, there is a  
jurisdictional signature requirement in light of the  
thirty-day rule under Appellate Rule 4, and in light of  
Civil Rule 11, which indeed does contain a signature  
requirement. The problem with the sixth circuit's  
reliance on Civil Rule 11 is that it not only contains a  
signature requirement, but it also contains a remedy for  
the absence of a signature. And in this particular case,  
everyone agrees -- the court-appointed amicus curiae

1 included -- that Mr. Becker was never given an opportunity  
2 to correct this omission of a signature, whether at the  
3 district court or the court of appeals level.

4 QUESTION: I should know this -- when you file a  
5 notice of appeal, do you file with the district court?

6 MR. SUTTON: You do, Your Honor.

7 QUESTION: So Rule 11 applies at that point?

8 MR. SUTTON: It does technically. In fact,  
9 Appellate Rule 1 arguably acknowledges that when it says  
10 all filings in a district court -- all filings in the  
11 courts of appeals that have been made through district  
12 courts have to comply with district court rules. So it  
13 does seem, as odd as it would appear, that Civil Rule 11  
14 does apply to a notice of appeal, keeping in mind that  
15 Civil Rule 11 is pretty broad in nature. It says  
16 pleadings and quote other papers. So arguably that does  
17 include a notice of appeal.

18 QUESTION: If I were on the court of appeals and  
19 I thought that Rule 11 requires a signature --

20 MR. SUTTON: Handwritten signature.

21 QUESTION: -- and I was a little fussy about it,  
22 what would I do? Just under Rule 11 just say, well, will  
23 you please cure this non-jurisdictional deficiency?

24 MR. SUTTON: It is problematic, Your Honor, and  
25 I think the answer is Appellate Rule 1 which does, as I

1     noted, make clear that you do have to comply with the  
2     district court rules and the Rules of Civil Procedure.

3             In light of Appellate Rule 1, a court of appeals  
4     or a court of appeals clerk's office would be fully within  
5     its rights to contact in this case Mr. Becker, saying, Mr.  
6     Becker, we see you've typed your signature. In this  
7     circuit we prefer a handwritten pen and ink signature.

8             QUESTION: And please clean up your act a  
9     little, okay?

10            MR. SUTTON: Well --

11            QUESTION: Clean -- clean it up within thirty  
12     days. I mean, that's the problem. You do have a remedy,  
13     but why doesn't the remedy have to have been applied  
14     within the thirty-day time limit?

15            MR. SUTTON: Your Honor, the only thing that has  
16     to be done within thirty days is to make sure you've  
17     established an intent to appeal. You can establish an  
18     intent to appeal as this Court is --

19            QUESTION: Does it say that -- it says you have  
20     to establish an intent to appeal within thirty days? I  
21     thought it said that you had to file within thirty days a  
22     notice of appeal which includes a signature, which I take  
23     to mean a written signature in normal parts.

24            MR. SUTTON: Well, as this Court has construed  
25     Rule 4 and Rule 3 of the Appellate Rules in Smith and

1 Torres, it has said the touchstone for jurisdiction is to  
2 establish the intent to appeal within thirty days. That's  
3 --

4 QUESTION: I don't know how good law Smith is.

5 MR. SUTTON: You don't know how good law Smith  
6 is?

7 QUESTION: Yeah. There were a couple of cases  
8 decided back in the 1960s that really stretch the  
9 language, I think.

10 MR. SUTTON: Well, I may be referring to the  
11 wrong Smith decision. I'm referring to Smith v. Barry,  
12 Your Honor, which is a 9-0 decision in which the Court  
13 said that a merits brief would suffice to establish a --  
14 or could suffice to establish intent to appeal within  
15 thirty days. That was the case in which the appellant  
16 missed the time for filing the notice of appeal because  
17 they weren't sure when -- they hadn't -- weren't sure when  
18 the notice -- the judgment was entered. They then  
19 fortuitously filed their merits brief within the thirty-  
20 day period, and this Court said in a 9-0 decision that --

21 QUESTION: I wasn't referring to Smith.

22 MR. SUTTON: I do think there are some older  
23 cases that aren't necessarily reflected in the current  
24 rules, but --

25 QUESTION: Mr. Sutton, could we go back to your

1     answer to Justice Kennedy about Rule 11 -- isn't the  
2     answer on the other side that once you file the notice of  
3     appeal, authority over the case passes from the district  
4     court to the court of appeals, so at that point, up until  
5     the notice of appeal, you're in the district court. Once  
6     you file that notice, you are in the court of appeals and  
7     Rule 11 is a rule directed to district court and not the  
8     court of appeals. So the cure that Rule 11 provides, at  
9     least so the argument goes, would not be available in the  
10    court of appeals.

11               MR. SUTTON: And Your Honor, that is why I was  
12    relying on Appellate Rule 1 which incorporates those  
13    rules, and that would therefore give appellate courts  
14    authority to make sure that someone did correct the  
15    signature. If they wanted at that point to decide, well,  
16    if you're not going to correct it -- you're going to be  
17    unrepentant when it comes to this particular requirement,  
18    at that point we are going to dismiss your appeal, and in  
19    fact will do so on the merits.

20               QUESTION: Of course, I suppose if you haven't  
21    filed a proper notice of appeal, you're still in the  
22    district court. I mean, you could argue it the other way  
23    that if indeed a signature is required and you file it  
24    without a signature in the court of appeals, it is  
25    ineffective and so the case remains in the district court.

1                   MR. SUTTON:  What the court has said and what  
2   the rules reflect is that as soon as the district court  
3   clerk receives the notice of appeal, it doesn't say  
4   anything about validity, it is immediately sent to the  
5   court of appeals.  And I think -- but I think that does  
6   raise a second answer to Mr. Baker's argument -- the point  
7   Justice Ginsburg is getting at, it is true that to find a  
8   notice of appeal immediately vests jurisdiction in the  
9   court of appeals over the merits of the case, but that  
10  doesn't preclude district courts from acting on collateral  
11  matters; that's when they can act on stay motions, bond  
12  motions, attorney fee motions.  This arguably could be such  
13  a collateral act.  It wouldn't go to the merits of the  
14  case.  It would, however, and I think there would be one  
15  problem here, and that would be interpretation.  The  
16  district courts would have authority to enforce this as a  
17  jurisdictional rule, and you would have district court  
18  judges dismissing appeals of their own cases.  That seems  
19  problematic, and I think kind --

20                  QUESTION:  Mr. -- Mr. Sutton, the Federal Rule  
21  of Appellate Procedure 3 does say that a pro se notice of  
22  appeal is considered filed on behalf of the signer --

23                  MR. SUTTON:  Yes.

24                  QUESTION:  -- which gives some indication that a  
25  signature is expected.



1                   MR. SUTTON: Yes, Justice O'Connor, and if I  
2     could answer this question, it may be helpful to be  
3     looking at the rules. I am looking at the State of Ohio's  
4     red brief, I'm at 5(A) where they've got a helpful  
5     collection of what I think were pertinent rules.

6                   QUESTION: What page?

7                   MR. SUTTON: 5(A).

8                   QUESTION: 5(A).

9                   MR. SUTTON: I'm at the Appendix -- so it's the  
10    very back.

11                  QUESTION: Okay.

12                  MR. SUTTON: And Justice O'Connor correctly is  
13    pointing to what I think is the best argument that has  
14    been made -- the amicus curiae argument -- and that's  
15    Appellate Rule 3(C)(2) which does refer to the word  
16    signer, and it does come out of nowhere -- that there is  
17    nothing else in the Appellate Rules that refers to the  
18    verbs sign, or the noun sign, or a signature, and suddenly  
19    in 1993 they do this.

20                  Well, I guess one quick question is if Mr.  
21    Baker's interpretation is correct, how in the world would  
22    you enforce it? Put yourself in the position of the poor  
23    clerk of, let's say, the sixth circuit. They get, let's  
24    say, Mr. Becker's notice of appeal but instead of a  
25    typewritten signature, it just says Becker in the caption,

1 Becker in the body, blank -- we'll say for the sake of  
2 argument -- signature line. How would you know whether  
3 the person is represented or not? You would have no way  
4 of knowing whether the attorney -- you don't have to sign  
5 rule -- or the pro se -- you do have to sign rule,  
6 applies.

7 Indeed, the only way to enforce it would have  
8 the clerk do what I think they should be doing in these  
9 cases, which is picking up the phone and calling and  
10 saying you need to be signing, you need to include that  
11 appellant.

12 Of course if the question under Mr. Baker's rule  
13 was the clerk now calls and says are you represented,  
14 well, there is a good answer and a bad answer to that  
15 question. If you say you're represented, you're okay.  
16 Jurisdiction vested, you didn't have to sign, and if you  
17 say you're pro se, you're gone. So I can't imagine that's  
18 what they meant, given that particular problem.

19 The only problem with it -- there is actually a  
20 few -- is if you turn the page to 6(a) and look at Rule  
21 3(C)(4) --

22 QUESTION: Let me interrupt you for a second  
23 with that first hypothetical, you're assuming that he  
24 calls a person up and he says he is represented, but then  
25 everything is okay?

1 MR. SUTTON: Because Mr. Baker, I think, as he  
2 has to say --

3 QUESTION: But no lawyer signed anything. You  
4 are assuming that there would be appeals in which the  
5 lawyer signed them -- filed them without ever signing  
6 anything.

7 MR. SUTTON: Exactly, which does happen. Some  
8 of the lower court cases are cases where even the attorney  
9 didn't sign -- in other words, you don't have to be a pro  
10 se litigant to make a mistake. I mean, many of the lower  
11 court cases involve non-pro se situations. You've got a  
12 caption, notice of appeal, no signature at all.

13 QUESTION: And your position is that if there's  
14 an unsigned notice of appeal, it vests jurisdiction if the  
15 man has a lawyer, but it does not if the man does not have  
16 a lawyer? I mean, you're saying --

17 MR. SUTTON: That's Mr. Baker's -- that's Mr.  
18 Baker's -- excuse me that's not his position. That's a  
19 consequence of his position in my view, and I'm making the  
20 point I can't imagine doing that. I mean, that's utterly  
21 bizarre. But I think it's confirmed -- this, the reading  
22 --

23 QUESTION: Well, maybe the answer is that there  
24 shouldn't be jurisdiction in either case if nobody signed  
25 anything.

1 MR. SUTTON: Well, that may be the right res --  
2 the best policy, but there's nothing that supports that  
3 view. There is nothing in appellate rules that says as to  
4 individuals represented by counsel -- they must sign.  
5 That requirement doesn't exist anywhere, so that we would  
6 be making up after the fact, right now, just for Dale  
7 Becker's case.

8 QUESTION: Well, while you're on that, I know  
9 you want to read number 4 which says if you make a  
10 mistake, it's a stupid mistake; it doesn't count.

11 MR. SUTTON: And 3(A)(2) while we're at it.

12 QUESTION: I realize.

13 MR. SUTTON: Yes, yes.

14 QUESTION: All right. That says that at the top  
15 of page 6(A).

16 MR. SUTTON: Exactly.

17 QUESTION: But I did have a question direct --

18 MR. SUTTON: Justice Breyer, can I just add one?  
19 You're doing a very good job for me, but I just want to  
20 add this point -- the clause you are relying -- you are  
21 pointed out was added in 1993. In other words, it was  
22 added the same time Appellate Rule 3(C)(2) was added.  
23 These were all post-Torres amendments liberalizing, making  
24 it easier to indicate an intent to -- I'm sorry.

25 QUESTION: I mean, just while you were on the

1 jurisdictional mysticism of, you know, whether it  
2 dissolves or where the jurisdiction is, as I read this,  
3 and tell me if this is correct or not, whether it supports  
4 you or not, I want to know if it is right.

5 As I read it, if your notice complies with all  
6 the conditions of Rule 4, it is valid. Nowhere in that  
7 does it say that you actually have to sign. So suppose  
8 you don't sign it? It's still valid.

9 MR. SUTTON: Right.

10 QUESTION: It still does everything the thing  
11 does, but under Rule 11 if you didn't sign it, it could be  
12 stricken. It doesn't say it wasn't valid; it says  
13 specifically what you do. You failed to sign it;  
14 therefore the valid notice would be stricken if somebody  
15 discovers it wasn't signed. But before you strike it, you  
16 give a person a chance to sign it.

17 MR. SUTTON: Yes.

18 QUESTION: Is that right?

19 MR. SUTTON: Yes.

20 QUESTION: So all this jurisdictional stuff is  
21 beside the point, because the rules are fairly clear that  
22 there is just -- even if it isn't signed, it acts just  
23 like it was signed, but it is subject to being stricken.

24 MR. SUTTON: In the first respect and that  
25 respect you've made the argument that --

1 QUESTION: Mr. Sutton, let me go back --  
2 MR. SUTTON: That's right.  
3 QUESTION: That's right.  
4 QUESTION: Mr. Sutton, we go back to the problem  
5 that you and discussed before in relation to Justice  
6 Breyer's question. The argument that Rule 11 is out of  
7 it. Once you file the notice of appeal, authority passes  
8 to the court of appeals; therefore, the part of Rule 11  
9 that says you can hear it is no longer operative because  
10 that rule is directed to district courts and not court of  
11 appeals, and it sets the argument.  
12 MR. SUTTON: And you're in this -- you know --  
13 metaphysical netherworld where you can never correct and  
14 you can never appeal.  
15 QUESTION: But in the real world I'm wondering  
16 how this mistake -- who caught it? Because there was  
17 already a briefing schedule when this turned up. Who  
18 found that the notice of appeal hadn't been signed?  
19 MR. SUTTON: I have no idea. I mean, before  
20 this, before Mr. Becker's case the sixth circuit had a  
21 general rule that they'd applied only in multiple  
22 appellant pro se cases where the absence of, quote, a  
23 signature created this jurisdictional defect, and that's,  
24 they dismissed the appellants who had not signed. And I  
25 assume what happened, but again, I am assuming, I have no

1     idea what happened. All I know is that it took seven  
2     months for the appeal to be dismissed. So that leads me  
3     to believe this went to the section of the sixth circuits  
4     that handles those types of appeals.

5             Someone, at least partly correctly, realized  
6     their Mattingly Rule, saw that you had the typewritten  
7     signature, and I guess in an act of, you know, precision,  
8     at least in their view, thought that didn't count, but  
9     didn't give Mr. Becker an opportunity to argue otherwise  
10    that, you know, his typewritten signature would suffice  
11    or, for that matter, to make the point you should never  
12    apply this multiple party rule on the contest of a single  
13    appellant who's put his name on the notice of appeal three  
14    times.

15            QUESTION: Mr. Sutton -- oh, excuse me. You  
16    mentioned the multiple appellants, and that was the  
17    problem of one person filing a notice of appeal, putting  
18    down a lot of other names, and you didn't know whether the  
19    other names really wanted to appeal. How is that situation  
20    handled today?

21            MR. SUTTON: Well, this is division that really  
22    -- that did exist in the lower courts. There was not a  
23    division on the single appellant problem -- they've all  
24    ruled our way. But in the lower courts you've got some,  
25    take the seventh circuit as an example, that said it's

1 nonjurisdictional and they say they just simply ask  
2 someone to correct it and clarify whether all three  
3 appellants meant to appeal, even though only one of them  
4 hand-signed the notice.

5 And others say, no, that's jurisdictional. They  
6 look at this Court's decision in Torres and say you've got  
7 to establish within the four corners of the document  
8 within thirty days a, quote, intent to appeal. I think  
9 the seventh circuit view is the better view.

10 I mean, this is a minimalistic requirement. In  
11 fact, it all comes from a statute. The Rules aren't  
12 allowed under Rule 1 to expand or shrink the courts of  
13 appeals' jurisdictions; the only statutory requirement is  
14 28 U.S.C. 2107, and that just says just get your intent,  
15 just file the notice of appeals within thirty days. And  
16 if you --

17 QUESTION: Are you suggesting that the Rules  
18 could not put conditions on what you have to do to file a  
19 notice of appeal other than this statute?

20 MR. SUTTON: Not jurisdictional ones, Your  
21 Honor.

22 QUESTION: Why is that? What is the authority  
23 for that?

24 MR. SUTTON: The Rules Enabling Act. The Rules  
25 Enabling Act says that you can only create these rules for



1 the purposes applying and implementing these Court  
2 decisions and the administration of the lower court. It  
3 doesn't allow this Court or the lower courts or advisory  
4 committees to create rules that expand or shrink this  
5 Court's jurisdiction. Let me give you an example --

6 QUESTION: Well, that doesn't shrink the  
7 jurisdiction. You mean that a court would have, must  
8 under the statute accept a notice of appeal that consists  
9 of somebody coming in and singing it? It's not even in  
10 writing? I mean, surely -- surely the statute envisions  
11 that the court is going to set forth the procedures for  
12 effecting a notice of appeal.

13 MR. SUTTON: There's no doubt. You can set up  
14 procedures, and you can set up consequences for failing to  
15 follow those procedures. That's not this case. This is a  
16 case about the jurisdiction of the court of appeals, and  
17 I'm not sure I really want to answer your question or some  
18 others going down that road, because I've got a lot of  
19 angry mail from the court of appeals clerks, but I don't  
20 know why you can do that.

21 Let me give you an example in response to Mr.  
22 Chief Justice's question. I mean, I don't know why, in  
23 Rule 3 this Court can't promulgate rules that are then  
24 ultimately approved by Congress that say -- silently  
25 approved by Congress -- that says in order to have

1 jurisdiction in the Court of Appeals, you must have your  
2 facsimile number on the notice of appeals. How -- where  
3 do they have the authority to shrink the jurisdiction of  
4 that court of appeals? They could say you need to put  
5 your facsimile number on the notice of appeal as a rule,  
6 and then enforce that rule however they wish.

7 QUESTION: Well, how about the simple pro --  
8 does the statute say it has to be in writing?

9 MR. SUTTON: No.

10 QUESTION: Well, then how -- why not -- Answer  
11 the implied question from Justice Ginsburg -- can a court say  
12 the notice of appeal must be in writing and have it  
13 jurisdictional?

14 MR. SUTTON: I think that probably is not a  
15 problem. I mean, I think all you've got to do is  
16 establish an intent to appeal within thirty days, and it  
17 would seem -- the assumption there is that it is in  
18 writing, and I am sure that's what Congress assumed; I'm  
19 sure they didn't --

20 QUESTION: I'm interested in this statute. Now,  
21 what is that statute?

22 MR. SUTTON: 28 U.S.C. 2107.

23 QUESTION: 2107.

24 MR. SUTTON: That's the 30-day, it's in the back  
25 of our brief, the blue brief.

1 QUESTION: I know.

2 MR. SUTTON: If I could turn to this -- to the  
3 quote signature requirement, which is an alternative issue  
4 here, and as I think everyone knows, if you look at JA12,  
5 that is Mr. Becker's notice of appeal, and you will see  
6 he's got his name in three places, including on the,  
7 quote, signature line where he typed rather than hand-  
8 wrote his signature. And the question is whether the  
9 Appellate, Civil Rules or any other rules somehow require  
10 a pen-and-ink signature. There is no definition of the  
11 verb signed or the noun signature or signer anywhere in  
12 the Rules; that's not of much help.

13 The dictionary definition circa 1938 or even  
14 1993 are equivocal -- they go both directions -- so that's  
15 not of much help. And you've got the very real problem -  
16 - not in Mr. Becker's case but surely in the case of some  
17 appellants -- that some individuals may well not be able  
18 to, quote, pen and ink a notice of appeal.

19 You could imagine someone with a disability that  
20 could only type a notice of appeal; you could imagine an  
21 individual in a maximum security prison -- a pro se  
22 appellant -- where that particular warden doesn't allow  
23 the inmates to have --

24 QUESTION: Mr. Sutton, do you think if somebody  
25 said would you please sign this check and I typed my name

1 on it that I would have signed it?

2 MR. SUTTON: Well, some of our cases actually  
3 are bank note cases, Your Honor. But I do think the answer  
4 to your question is most people would pen and ink it. I  
5 agree with you. But that's also why most banks have on  
6 hand a copy of each client's signature. We don't do that  
7 in courts of appeals.

8 QUESTION: Is pen and ink it a term you have  
9 coined for this case?

10 MR. SUTTON: That's a fair criticism, Your  
11 Honor. I have.

12 QUESTION: Although you do say that the bank  
13 keeps a record of each client's signature, by which you  
14 mean pen and ink, right?

15 MR. SUTTON: I do mean pen and ink. I think  
16 everyone ought to have some liberty to coin phrases here  
17 since there are no definitions at all, and I think the  
18 advocates are stuck a little bit for that reason.

19 But there doesn't seem -- I mean, form follows  
20 function here. There's no reason which it comes to a  
21 notice of appeal why it has to be in pen and ink. The  
22 point is to establish an intent to appeal. It is a  
23 minimal threshold. At that point, any doubt about who is  
24 involved and who's not can be readily clarified by the  
25 court --

1           QUESTION: It's just that the argument that you  
2 could just type it in, rather than to the problem with  
3 multiple parties again. The one appellant can just type  
4 in the names of a lot of people who don't want to appeal.

5           MR. SUTTON: That is true, but Your Honor, that  
6 is assuming that pro se appellants and pro se appellants  
7 only are more likely to commit fraud. I don't think that  
8 that's a fair assumption. I mean, the notion of an  
9 impostor appellant --

10          QUESTION: Well, I'm not just saying anything  
11 about pro se -- just someone types in his own name and two  
12 other names of people who were parties in the district  
13 court but who haven't signed it.

14          MR. SUTTON: My point is the only reason to  
15 require a pen and ink signature requirement is because  
16 you're fearful that the individual that did the typing is  
17 somehow misleading the court and pulling a fast one on his  
18 or her co-appellants. That is not confirming they do  
19 indeed want to appeal.

20          I think it's a fair assumption when you see in  
21 the body of the notice of appeal all three parties listed,  
22 or for that matter in the caption as the Rule allows --  
23 that's enough. I mean, I don't care whether it has one  
24 signature or no signatures -- you've conveyed an intent to  
25 appeal.

1                   QUESTION: Mr. Sutton, what about filing by e-  
2 e-mail? Do you think that would be okay?

3                   MR. SUTTON: Well, it's an interesting point. We  
4 do have a situation where some district courts are  
5 allowing e-mail type signatures --

6                   QUESTION: On notices of appeal?

7                   MR. SUTTON: Well, they're allowing -- I don't  
8 know whether the Northern District of Ohio is doing that.  
9 I know they're doing that generally when it comes to cases  
10 in their courts, and I think that --

11                  QUESTION: They don't have to allow it. You're  
12 telling us they have no power to forbid it.

13                  MR. SUTTON: A less common --

14                  QUESTION: Under the statute, I mean, that's  
15 your position under the statute, isn't it?

16                  MR. SUTTON: Your Honor, of all people, this --  
17 I mean, we've got a separation of powers problem here.  
18 Congress says there is -- there is a thirty-day  
19 requirement in the statute, and that's all it says. And  
20 suddenly the courts are allowed to decide who to push out  
21 and who to include in?

22                  QUESTION: But the Congress had used the word  
23 notice of appeal, and the notice of appeal, as the  
24 understanding has been, means a document that says notice  
25 of appeal, and I hereby, and then it has a signature which

1     you sign or counsel signs.

2                 MR. SUTTON:  And I think that is the best  
3     argument when it comes to interpreting the Congressional  
4     statute -- that in other words, the notice of appeal does  
5     come with certain assumptions.  There is nowhere, though,  
6     that that assumption has to include the handwritten  
7     signature.  There's no assumption on that?

8                 QUESTION:  Shouldn't --

9                 MR. SUTTON:  Based on the law or the cases?

10                QUESTION:  Mr. Sutton, you reach an interesting  
11     conclusion if you put together the first and the second  
12     parts of your argument.  In the first part you assume that  
13     a signature meant a written signature and you said, well,  
14     you know, if it isn't written but so long as your name is  
15     there, that's good enough -- it's properly filed.  In the  
16     second part of your argument you're now assuming that  
17     signature just means a typewritten signature, so I assume  
18     it would follow that if you left that out, it will also be  
19     properly filed.  So I could file a sheet of paper with no  
20     name on it and I've filed a proper appeal.

21                MR. SUTTON:  Your Honor, I --

22                QUESTION:  Not even a typewritten name, because  
23     in the first part of your argument you say you don't need  
24     the signature, so if I apply that to your second part of  
25     the argument -- we have appeals, we don't know who has

1     appealed.  We know somebody has filed a notice of appeal,  
2     but --

3                 MR. SUTTON:  Your Honor, I'm not sure -- first  
4     of all, I'm not entirely sure I understood the way you  
5     characterized the first part of my argument, so let me  
6     tell you how I have been trying to argue it which is that  
7     you don't need anything.  That is my point.  The first  
8     argument is that you don't need a typewritten,  
9     handwritten, an X, anything.

10                QUESTION:  Not even a name?

11                MR. SUTTON:  Yes, you do need a name.

12                QUESTION:  Why do you need a name?  It is only  
13     the signature requirement that says you need the name.

14                MR. SUTTON:  Look at 12 -- look at 12(A).  Look  
15     at 12(A) which is the joint -- in the Joint Appendix --  
16     and this is the sample notice of appeal that Mr. Becker  
17     got from the sixth circuit and he used, and this is what  
18     most notice of appeals look like -- they are one page.  
19     What you do have to do is within thirty days convey an  
20     intent to appeal.

21                You can do that without any signature at all.  
22     You can do that with your name in the caption.  In fact,  
23     Rule 3 says that.  You can --

24                QUESTION:  You're saying intent includes who --  
25     who intends.  That's your answer to these questions.



1 MR. SUTTON: Exactly.

2 QUESTION: But what if you have a multi-party  
3 case, and no signature at all on the appeal? That doesn't  
4 tell you who is appealing.

5 MR. SUTTON: Sure it does, Your Honor. If in  
6 the, it says notice is hereby given that blank -- and it  
7 says Dale G. Becker, John Smith and John Moore -- and then  
8 you've got a blank signature line.

9 QUESTION: But the courts made up those forms,  
10 no? I mean -- you say that, you know, you could draft  
11 your own form, right --

12 MR. SUTTON: Absolutely.

13 QUESTION: -- under the statute.

14 MR. SUTTON: Absolutely.

15 QUESTION: And we're exceeding -- we're  
16 destroying the separation of powers if we stick to that  
17 form, right?

18 MR. SUTTON: Your Honor, I'm not saying the  
19 forms are jurisdictional. I'm using the forms to try to  
20 visualize the issue. I'm not making any concession  
21 they're jurisdictional -- I'm just trying to help us  
22 visualize it, and you were suggesting you've got the poor  
23 clerk at the sixth circuit gets a notice of appeal with no  
24 signature, and they don't know what to do.

25 That's just not true. Whether it is one

1     appellant or fifty-five appellants.  If in the body of the  
2     notice of appeal or the caption, as the rules say, the  
3     appellants are all listed, how can there possibly be any  
4     jurisdictional doubt as to who is trying to appeal?  There  
5     is no doubt.

6             QUESTION:  Except that when you sign something,  
7     you give your own individual imprimatur to what is said in  
8     the text that you're signing, and to simply have your name  
9     incorporated in the text that you have indicated no  
10    approval of, I think, falls short.

11            MR. SUTTON:  But, Your Honor, that's one  
12    possibility, and your suggestion is that when they don't  
13    sign, they somehow decide at the last second -- I'm going  
14    to put my name in the pile --

15            QUESTION:  For all I know, they've never seen  
16    it.

17            MR. SUTTON:  That's possible, Your Honor, but  
18    that goes back to my response to Justice Ginsburg.  
19    Somehow the assumption that there's someone committing  
20    fraud or there are impostor appellants out there -- that's  
21    not a problem that exists.

22            QUESTION:  But certainly if you're not judgment-  
23    proof, you don't likely undertake an appeal because you  
24    can be assessed for costs if you lose it.  But if you are  
25    judgment-proof, presuming there's no real harm, you're not

1 going to suffer anything if you do appeal.

2 MR. SUTTON: Your Honor, the reason this lenity  
3 exists is not because people decide, oh, boy, I'm having  
4 doubts at the last second whether to put my signature  
5 here, it's because they make mistakes. And people make  
6 them all the time. God knows -- I mean, I can't think of a  
7 lawyer that hasn't made this kind of mistake. It gets  
8 filed without the signature, and that's exactly --

9 QUESTION: But isn't that -- you have gone, I  
10 think, a lot farther than you need to go. All you needed  
11 to do was just say the signature is curable after the  
12 thirty days, right?

13 MR. SUTTON: Absolutely. And that's what Rule  
14 3(C)(4) means exactly. So any doubt about this problem  
15 can be resolved after the thirty-day window which is the  
16 jurisdictional window. If I could save the rest of my  
17 time for rebuttal.

18 QUESTION: Very well, Mr. Sutton.

19 Mr. Baker, we'll hear from you.

20 ORAL ARGUMENT OF STEWART A. BAKER

21 ON BEHALF OF THE RESPONDENT

22 MR. BAKER: Thank you Mr. Chief Justice, and may  
23 it please the Court:

24 I would like to just correct one point that  
25 Petitioner's attorney made -- the Sixth Circuit has

1 applied their jurisdictional rule excluding unsigned  
2 notice of appeal to single appellants. They've done so in  
3 numerous unpublished opinions. The fact that they're  
4 unpublished, I think, suggests that they don't believe  
5 that there is any difference between single or multiple  
6 appellants, and that distinction has been introduced by  
7 Petitioner's attorney at this stage, and this stage only.

8 QUESTION: Mr. Baker, are there not courts where  
9 something like this would come into the clerk's office,  
10 the signature is lacking, the clerk would say, well, it  
11 was filed within the ninety days, so we'll send it back  
12 with the letter, very much as this Court does. When  
13 something is filed in this Court -- a cert petition and it  
14 is deficient but it is on time -- our clerk will send it  
15 back for the deficiency to be cured.

16 MR. BAKER: Yes. The -- the difficulty with  
17 that is that Rule 4 sets a thirty-day limit on filing of  
18 proper notice of appeal, and therefore if you can correct  
19 it within the thirty days there is not a problem, but if  
20 you can't correct it within the thirty days, there is a  
21 jurisdictional issue that arises. It arises --

22 QUESTION: Well, why should that be so if the  
23 intent to appeal is clear from the face of what was filed?  
24 We have spoken, I guess, in the Torres case that the  
25 touchstone is the clear intent to appeal, and if the

1 document is clear as it was in this case, who the  
2 appellant is and that it was timely filed and so on, why  
3 should that be jurisdictional and not correctable later?

4 MR. BAKER: The signature requirement is part of  
5 expressing the intent of the party to appeal. It's --  
6 since 1980, the courts of appeals have said that specify  
7 the party or parties taking the appeal includes in a pro  
8 se context the signature of the party who intends to take  
9 the appeal. Even in a single --

10 QUESTION: Well, there is no clear statutory  
11 rule requirement that it be signed.

12 MR. BAKER: I think that Rule 11 clearly  
13 requires that it be signed. I -- Rule 11 is incorporated,  
14 at least as far as the form of the filing, into the  
15 Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. And then Rule 3(c)  
16 clearly references an expectation that there will be a  
17 signer in every pro se notice of appeal.

18 QUESTION: There is. There is. But Rule 11  
19 says that you have to sign it, so if it's not signed,  
20 here's what we do. We strike it, but before we strike it  
21 we give the person a chance to sign it. That's what it  
22 says.

23 MR. BAKER: It says it shall be struck unless  
24 it's been cured after notice, which I think is a slightly  
25 more emphatic statement than --

1                   QUESTION:  So all right, all right, it says we  
2   really, really, really will strike it unless you sign it.  
3   Now, I think that that is -- I think it is hard given that  
4   to say that, you know, it will go through this  
5   jurisdictional thing or anything.  I take it the problem  
6   here is he wasn't given a chance to sign it.

7                   MR. BAKER:  Well, the difficulty with taking  
8   that approach is first that Rule 11 is a district court  
9   rule; it sets form requirements and it tells the court  
10  what it can do in response to an unsigned notice of  
11  appeal.  A portion of that comes to the Federal Rules of  
12  Appellate Procedure but simply the form requirements --  
13  not the authority to take action -- it would be very --

14                  QUESTION:  Why?  I mean, why do you draw that  
15  line?

16                  MR. BAKER:  Uh --

17                  QUESTION:  If the one is incorporated, why isn't  
18  the other?

19                  MR. BAKER:  Well, the legislative history for  
20  that says that in some instances the Federal Rules of  
21  Appellate Procedure provide that a motion must or may be  
22  filed in the district court -- I'm reading from our  
23  footnote on page seventeen in the green brief.  And then  
24  it goes on to say the proposed amendment would make it  
25  clear that when this is so, the motion or application is

1 to be made in the form and manner prescribed in the  
2 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In other words it says  
3 that if there is a form and manner requirement, you must  
4 meet it in the district court.

5 I think it would be unusual for the Federal  
6 Rules of Appellate Procedure to say, and by the way you  
7 can borrow whatever authority the district court may have.

8 QUESTION: Well, isn't -- isn't it authority  
9 that goes to the satisfaction of a form and manner  
10 requirement? Sure it is.

11 MR. BAKER: Well, it says -- but the requirement  
12 is that it be signed. I think the requirement is not that  
13 it be signed if you've gotten a notice from the court. It  
14 simply says it must be signed; it shall be stricken unless  
15 certain -- certain things have happened. Those --

16 QUESTION: It says it must be signed, and if it  
17 isn't signed, you have to sign it if you get a notice from  
18 the court. And if you don't do that, we strike it.  
19 That's what it --

20 MR. BAKER: If -- if we were only borrowing Rule  
21 11 here, I think this argument would be much stronger, but  
22 we -- the Advisory Committee has gone over this territory  
23 already, the courts of appeals, as I said, since 1980 have  
24 found that the jurisdictional language of Rule 3 includes  
25 the signature requirements -- not all of them, but the

1 Fourth Circuit, the Ninth Circuit, and others. And the  
2 Advisory Committee, which addressed this question after  
3 Torres made it quite clear that specify the parties is a  
4 jurisdictional requirement, had in front of them language  
5 that would have gotten rid of the signature requirement,  
6 and instead modified that language to make it clear that a  
7 signature was expected from every pro se party filing a  
8 notice of appeal.

9 QUESTION: Well, again, that's -- that's not --  
10 that's really not clear. I mean the one thing that rule  
11 -- that thing does is to say that the widow or the wife  
12 and the child can come along without signing it, I mean,  
13 we know that when they made that change in Rule 3, what  
14 they wanted to do is enable people to be parties who  
15 hadn't signed, and then to say, well, now, that instituted  
16 for the first time a -- a statement in the Rules that the  
17 pro se litigant must sign is kind of a backdoor way to  
18 create a signing requirement.

19 MR. BAKER: It's -- it's -- it's obviously not  
20 perfect, Your Honor. On the other hand, I have difficulty  
21 reading it as only saying that the signature requirement  
22 for the spouse and children which would be the result of  
23 saying, well, this -- this says there's a signature  
24 requirement of the spouse and child but it's met by the  
25 signature of the pro se party. I -- I'm not sure that



1 produces a more sensible rule than one that says it treats  
2 the pro se party and the pro se party's family members all  
3 the same. They are --

4 QUESTION: It may be it had in mind Torres and  
5 the problem of the person other than the one who files the  
6 notice, adding names. So that I think that the -- that  
7 that problem of the multi-party of appeal is what prompted  
8 -- prompted the change in the Rule.

9 MR. BAKER: I think that that's -- that's  
10 plausible if it were not for the fact that the Advisory  
11 Committee had in front of it language that would have  
12 achieved that without introducing a signature requirement  
13 or any notion of a signature requirement provided by  
14 public citizens. The -- the language provided by public  
15 citizens would have clearly undone the signature  
16 requirements that had been imposed by some of the courts  
17 of appeals.

18 QUESTION: Maybe they thought the signature  
19 requirement was there but non-jurisdictional. I mean,  
20 take a look at Rule 1 -- it says when these rules provide  
21 for filing a document in the district court, the procedure  
22 must comply with the practice of the district court. So  
23 it seems to me that if you file a -- perhaps a Rule  
24 (1)(a)(2), then you pick up all of Rule 11 and not just a  
25 piece of it.

1 MR. BAKER: That may well be, I -- but I think  
2 that it's -- it's impossible to pick up that Rule -- the  
3 -- the -- the Civil Rule of Procedure -- without taking  
4 into account Rule 4 which says the Notice of Appeal has to  
5 be filed within thirty days.

6 There is clearly a signature requirement under  
7 Rule 11; there is no doubt about that.

8 QUESTION: Why doesn't that mean that defects  
9 can be cured after the thirty days, just as it does in  
10 this Court?

11 MR. BAKER: I think the reason that it can't be  
12 is that the signature requirement has been pulled into  
13 Rule 3 for pro se parties by the direct reference to an  
14 expectation that the pro se party will sign the notice of  
15 appeal. It is hard to read that language without coming  
16 to the conclusion that there is something about the notice  
17 of appeal, and the standards for notice of appeal, that is  
18 --that requires a signature from pro se parties, and there  
19 are good, obviously policy, reasons for wanting to do  
20 that.

21 QUESTION: So then you are making the  
22 distinction that -- that Mr. Sutton suggested you were --  
23 that this is a requirement -- the signing requirement --  
24 this jurisdictional signing requirement applies only to  
25 pro se litigants and not to litigants with counsel.

1                   MR. BAKER: I think though that the principal  
2     problem that the signature requirement addresses is the  
3     risk that someone is practicing law -- probably without a  
4     license -- on behalf of a party who may or may not  
5     understand what is being done in his name. The signature  
6     requirement allows the court to be sure that the party who  
7     is nominally appearing pro se in fact has had a chance to  
8     think about what he is doing, and to examine the contents  
9     of what has been filed in his name. That is the reason  
10    that in multiple appellant cases -- this rule has been  
11    applied without controversy, yet because it is obvious  
12    there that one party may be proceeding to draft pleadings  
13    that the others may not have seen. But in the context of  
14    single appellants as well, there are numerous areas of law  
15    where there is an active cottage industry of assisting pro  
16    se litigants -- not just prison cases but bankruptcy  
17    cases, immigration cases, where people who hold themselves  
18    out as grievance consultants or other forms of quasi-  
19    lawyer, have taken to filing pro se papers on behalf of  
20    parties.

21                  The signature requirement at least requires that  
22    those pro se parties have a chance to see what has been  
23    done in their names.

24                  QUESTION: But you agree that it's -- that it's  
25    not jurisdictional with regard to -- to an attorney?

1 MR. BAKER: I -- I do agree with that. I think  
2 that if one reads this as narrowly as possible, that the  
3 signature requirement does not apply to represented  
4 parties. It applies, but the attorney --

5 QUESTION: Under the jurisdictional --

6 MR. BAKER: Right. And -- and there are reasons  
7 for that. If an attorney says I represent these parties  
8 and they're taking the appeal and he's not telling the  
9 truth, he's subject to a wide variety of sanctions that  
10 would not apply to a non-lawyer who made that same  
11 representation and therefore, it's a -- it's a plausible  
12 distinction to -- to draw.

13 QUESTION: Mr. Baker, one of the problems since  
14 we're dealing with a pro se litigant, gets this form from  
15 the Sixth Circuit, and it doesn't say, as the -- the  
16 sample attached to the Rules do, S with a signature. So  
17 then he gets a document from a court that doesn't even  
18 warn him that a signature is required, and then he's out  
19 the door because he -- he did everything that the -- that  
20 the document he got from the court called for.

21 MR. BAKER: I -- I -- think that's a difficulty.  
22 I -- I would suggest -- I don't know how Mr. Becker got  
23 that form. I -- I think it would be useful to take a look  
24 at the yellow brief pages of A-2 and A-3 because, in fact,  
25 the form that Mr. Becker got is outdated even by the sixth

1 circuit standards. If you go to the sixth circuit  
2 website, you go to the notices and download the forms, the  
3 form you will get is the form on page A-3 of the yellow  
4 brief, not on page A-2 which is the form that Mr. Becker  
5 submitted.

6 Indeed, if you look at the -- at the lower  
7 lefthand corner of each of those documents, you'll see  
8 that each of them is labeled 6CA3, which is the name of  
9 the -- the number of the form. Each of them in fact on  
10 the originals has a GPO designation, but the notice on  
11 page A-3 is dated January '99 as opposed to August of '79,  
12 and this is the pages -- the form on page A-3 is the form  
13 that is available to litigants, and that should be sent  
14 out, and it certainly calls for a signature, has the  
15 little s.

16 So there may well have been a mistake here in  
17 Mr. Becker's case, but I think it would be going beyond  
18 the facts that we have in the record to assume that this  
19 is a policy on the part of the Sixth Circuit to send out a  
20 notice of appeal when it's not --

21 QUESTION: The whole problem is that he wasn't  
22 given an opportunity. The Sixth Circuit said, thirty days  
23 are up, no signature, that's it. Nothing else is  
24 relevant.

25 MR. BAKER: Mr. Becker has filed nearly twenty

1 cases in the Federal and State courts in Ohio; he has  
2 signed practically every paper he's filed in practically  
3 every one of those cases, including all of his notices of  
4 appeal to the Sixth Circuit in past cases. Rule 11 says  
5 sign everything you file in the district court. I -- I  
6 think it would be aggressive for him to suggest that  
7 simply because the s was missing from this form, he  
8 doesn't have to pay any attention to those -- those rules.

9 QUESTION: Well, again it's not a question of  
10 not paying attention; it's a question of whether it can be  
11 cured, whether we know that the thirty days can't be cured  
12 once that runs, but the -- the question is whether  
13 something like the signature shouldn't be curable, when  
14 everything is there, his name is -- is in the caption, his  
15 name is in the body of the notice.

16 MR. BAKER: But when one has that one is  
17 confronted with a notice of appeal, as is the typical case  
18 -- and here we've had a half a dozen substantive motions  
19 and briefs, and so we're starting to get a feel for Mr.  
20 Becker and what his intent was -- but the purpose of the  
21 requirement is to know immediately, and in a way that's  
22 not easily deniable by the appellant -- what his intent  
23 is, that he actually intends to file this appeal and be  
24 bound by the consequences, even if they're bad, as they  
25 may well be for a frivolous appeal.

1                   If I could touch briefly on the question of  
2   whether the Rules Enabling Act prevents the application of  
3   this rule, I think it is answered by the Torres case which  
4   said, after all, that even though it was perfectly obvious  
5   in that case that all of the plaintiffs who had lost  
6   intended to seek the appeal, the fact that one of the  
7   plaintiffs' names had been left off of the document meant  
8   that there was no notice of appeal as to him, and that the  
9   requirements of the parties be specified with a  
10   jurisdictional requirement. I don't think the Rules  
11   Enabling Act said, wait a minute, you're narrowing the  
12   scope of the notice of appeal.

13                  QUESTION: But there was a total absence of the  
14   name any place, and I think -- if I understand you right,  
15   Mr. Baker, you are asking us to equate the lack of a  
16   signature with the total absence of the name of the would-  
17   be appellant any place in the notice.

18                  MR. BAKER: Yes, I am, because that was the  
19   position since at least 1980 of some of the courts of  
20   appeals and the position that we believe was adopted by  
21   the Advisory Committee in 1993.

22                  QUESTION: It is one thing to say, look, you --  
23   you weren't even named any place in this notice within  
24   the thirty days, so we're not going to let you -- you  
25   can't become an appellant after as opposed to yes, you're

1     named in the caption, yes, you're named in the body, all  
2     that's lacking is the signature. That we can let you do  
3     after the thirty days.

4             MR. BAKER: Of course, one could draw the  
5     distinction -- I'm not sure that the Rules Enabling Act  
6     would say that that distinction is the -- is the limit of  
7     what the Court's authority is. I think the Court has the  
8     authority to say we want you to specify the party -- the  
9     party taking the appeal in a manner that leaves the party  
10    no room to back out later.

11            QUESTION: Have the courts of appeals which you  
12    say have applied this Rule since 1980, have they applied  
13    it only to pro se filings, or do they apply it to --

14            MR. BAKER: The cases that I have seen apply it  
15    to pro se pleadings. I have not seen it applied  
16    jurisdictionally to represented parties.

17            QUESTION: Mr. Baker, let me just ask you, one  
18    of the tough things about your -- your position, of  
19    course, is this contrast between the pro se litigant and  
20    the represented litigant, and your response, in part, is  
21    that while there are disciplinary sanctions on the lawyer  
22    who doesn't -- who actually fails to sign and so forth,  
23    but does that -- is that really a complete response  
24    because isn't there still the danger that a representative  
25    -- a represented appellant might have some friend who,



1 without authority, went ahead and filed a notice of appeal  
2 without even the lawyer knowing about it.

3 MR. BAKER: Well, if he -- if he did then it  
4 wouldn't have the lawyer's signature on it. It would have  
5 someone else's signature on it.

6 QUESTION: Well, but I thought -- I thought you  
7 were saying even if the lawyer had not signed it, it would  
8 not be jurisdictional.

9 MR. BAKER: Even if the lawyer had -- if he was  
10 a represented party, he filed pro se?

11 QUESTION: No, a represented -- my hypothetical  
12 is a represented party on whose behalf a typewritten  
13 notice of appeal is filed without the knowledge of either  
14 the lawyer who represents him or the man himself -- the  
15 man or woman himself. That's not a jurisdictional defect,  
16 is it?

17 MR. BAKER: I would say it was because it  
18 doesn't have a signature from the pro se party, and it's  
19 not -- you haven't specified the party's intent to --

20 QUESTION: Well, then there isn't this  
21 distinction between representative and non-representative  
22 parties.

23 MR. BAKER: I -- I -- I -- if I have thought of  
24 it in terms of a represented party where the lawyer is  
25 actually pursuing the appeal.

1                   QUESTION: But am I correct then -- maybe I  
2     don't have the facts right in my mind. Assume a  
3     represented party who has a lawyer -- a paper is filed  
4     which purports to be a notice of appeal on behalf of that  
5     person and not signed by anybody. Is that a jurisdictional  
6     defect or is it not?

7                   MR. BAKER: It may not be a jurisdictional  
8     defect, but it is obviously easily struck because it  
9     doesn't represent the intent of the party. If it -- if it  
10    purports to be a pro se petition, notice of appeal, then  
11    it's jurisdictionally deficient. If it purports to be on  
12    an attorney notice of appeal, then it's fraught.

13                  QUESTION: Even though, in fact, it was not  
14    prepared by the attorney?

15                  MR. BAKER: Yes.

16                  QUESTION: Okay.

17                  I would like to take just a minute on the  
18    question of the -- whether a typed name can constitute a  
19    signature. I think that's been addressed at considerable  
20    length already. My first point, and I apologize for  
21    raising it at this stage, is there is a question whether  
22    this is fairly covered by the question presented, but the  
23    Court drafted a question presented that presumes there has  
24    been a failure to sign here. It did so after the  
25    petitioner had filed a petition that made reference to

1 some of the cases that address the question whether a  
2 signed notice of appeal could be -- whether a signing  
3 constituted typing. So there is a real question whether  
4 the Court in framing this question didn't exclude this  
5 issue or --

6 QUESTION: You're saying we've proceeded on the  
7 assumption that there was a failure to sign.

8 MR. BAKER: Exactly, and therefore either you've  
9 already decided this, which I suspect is not the  
10 appropriate answer, or it's not part of the case because  
11 there was no conflict in the circuits on that question.

12 If I could turn also to the question of a lawyer  
13 not signing -- I think Mr. Sutton made the argument that  
14 an attorney -- if you were a represented party and you did  
15 not sign, it would not be jurisdictional. If you were a  
16 non-represented party and you did not sign, it would be  
17 jurisdictional, and that there would be some doubt about  
18 that possibility raised the prospect, I think, of people  
19 trying to game the system by rushing out and hiring  
20 lawyers or having lawyers submit things that weren't  
21 signed.

22 I think it's worth remembering this is not a  
23 difficult requirement to meet. Signing the notice of  
24 appeal is an easy thing to do; it provides useful  
25 confirmation to the court that every party who is part of

1 the notice of appeal actually has seen and has willingly  
2 joined in it. And so the likelihood that people will game  
3 this system in order to avoid signing the notice of appeal  
4 I think is -- is highly unlikely.

5 QUESTION: Mr. Baker, is there anything in your  
6 view that is quote jurisdictional, other than the one  
7 thing we all agree, is the thirty days is jurisdictional.  
8 Now you say the signing requirement, at least to a pro se  
9 litigant, is. Is there anything else that you would rank  
10 as jurisdictional so you would be disqualified as an  
11 appellant?

12 MR. BAKER: This Court has -- has tended to say  
13 that Rule 3 is jurisdictional in general terms. Certainly  
14 I would say that Rule 3(c) and its provisions which say  
15 that you must specify the party or parties taking the  
16 appeal -- that's what the Torres case held, that failure  
17 to specify is a jurisdictional fault, designation of the  
18 judgment appealed from, designation of the court appealed  
19 to. And as I said, most -- many courts had held that to  
20 specify the party included a signature requirement as part  
21 of determining intent to appeal.

22 QUESTION: But is anything other than naming a  
23 person as a party that couldn't be cured after the thirty  
24 days are up, and some of the other things that you  
25 mentioned?

1 MR. BAKER: None of those things can be cured  
2 after the thirty days has -- has run, and I believe that's  
3 established law.

4 I would like to --

5 QUESTION: I know that the Torres establishes  
6 law, but I don't know that any of the others say that you  
7 can't cure a defect. As long as something is clearly  
8 identifiable as a notice of appeal, what is it that says  
9 that errors in designating the, the details, are  
10 incurable?

11 MR. BAKER: The -- the court in Smith against  
12 Barry, and to a degree in Torres, suggested that the  
13 functional equivalent of a notice of appeal is all that is  
14 required, but by functional equivalent the -- the Court  
15 has essentially treated the three elements that must be in  
16 a notice of appeal as what must be conveyed in one form or  
17 another. It doesn't have to be in the form of a notice of  
18 appeal, but that information has got to be part of the  
19 notice of appeal or, in the absence of one of those  
20 elements, it's jurisdictionally --

21 QUESTION: And the elements are who is  
22 appealing, and what else?

23 MR. BAKER: What he's appealing, and where he's  
24 appealing to.

25 QUESTION: Yes. And all of that is in this

1 notice -- who is appealing, what he's appealing, and who  
2 he's appealing to.

3 MR. BAKER: I -- I -- I would -- I would argue  
4 that in fact when the Advisory Committee -- the only  
5 substantive revision of Rule 3(c) that's been made was  
6 made in 1993 by the Advisory Committee. When they made  
7 that change, there was none of this division into sub --  
8 separate subparagraphs of 3(C). There was a requirement  
9 to do the three things -- to specify the three things.  
10 The first was specify the parties, and what the Advisory  
11 Committee did was insert this reference to a signature by  
12 a pro se party directly after the requirement that the  
13 party taking the appeal be specified, and I think the only  
14 conclusion you can draw from that is they believed that  
15 they were providing a gloss on how to specify the party or  
16 parties taking the appeal.

17 QUESTION: And yet there's not one word from the  
18 Advisory Committee that suggests this is quote  
19 jurisdictional.

20 MR. BAKER: Torres had already done that most  
21 emphatically --

22 QUESTION: With respect to a party not being  
23 named at all.

24 MR. BAKER: Yes. But as I said, the entire  
25 effort by the Advisory Committee was to insert -- it was

1 to clarify what it meant to specify the party so people  
2 wouldn't make mistakes in the future.

3 If I could make one point in closing, it's that  
4 I was struck as I was reading the cases that we've been  
5 talking about here, such as Torres, the Foman case from  
6 the '60s, Houston and Flack -- all of the cases that  
7 construe the rules of the court -- of the appellate courts  
8 -- that almost none of them have survived in terms of  
9 their holdings. Almost every one has been modified by the  
10 Advisory Committee and the rules process.

11 Given the number of problems we've turned up in  
12 this area, I think that it's inevitable that this issue is  
13 bound for the Advisory Committee one way or the other, and  
14 yet we still cite all those cases, and we cite them not  
15 for their particular holding, but for the way they  
16 analyzed these problems. If they say, well, you know, the  
17 rules can be bent to achieve a certain aim, then that's  
18 what they stand for. If they say the rules should be read  
19 in as straightforward and lawyerly a way as one can and  
20 take the consequences, then that's what those rules --  
21 those cases stand for. I would submit that if you take  
22 the latter course, the Sixth Circuit should be affirmed.

23 Thank you.

24 QUESTION: Mr. Baker, you served as an amicus  
25 for the Court in this case, and we thank you for your

1 services. Mr. Sutton, you have four minutes remaining.

2 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF JEFFREY S. SUTTON

3 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

4 MR. SUTTON: A few brief points. First of all,  
5 in defense of Dale Becker, the form he used is actually  
6 the form that's now attached to the Sixth Circuit rules.  
7 It is not outdated. It is attached to their current  
8 rules.

9 Second, the notion that prison inmates should be  
10 consulting websites to get the forms doesn't seem to me  
11 plausible.

12 Third, when it comes to the forms that Mr. Baker  
13 has relied upon, if you look at our yellow brief, there is  
14 a great irony here to his argument that this signature  
15 rule only applies to pro se appellants. Every one of the  
16 forms refers to signatures for attorneys. If you look at  
17 the one that's attached to the Federal Rules -- that's at  
18 A-1 -- it's clear the signature requirement is not for the  
19 pro se -- it says the s and then attorney. And then you  
20 look at Mr Becker's -- Baker's -- Becker's form, it's  
21 counsel for appellant. You then look at the next one and  
22 it has attorney. Every single one of them, if there is a  
23 signature requirement at all, it's referring to attorneys.  
24 There is no indication that pro se litigants and pro se  
25 litigants alone are expected to sign these things in



1     whatever manner.

2                 Every other point that Mr. Baker has raised --  
3     and there are many policy problems out there -- they are  
4     all problems that show at most there is a signature  
5     requirement, not a signature jurisdictional requirement.

6                 Every single one of those issues can be cured  
7     and addressed after the thirty days.   Thank you.

8                 CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST:   Thank you, Mr. Sutton.  
9     The case is submitted.

10                (Whereupon, at 10:56 a.m., the case in the  
11     above-entitled matter was submitted.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25