
HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

REQUESTING THE JUDICIARY TO ASSESS THE FAMILY COURT SERVICES AND
PROCESSES.

1 WHEREAS, Senate Resolution No. 40, Regular Session of 2004,
2 authorized the Senate Committee on Human Services to convene
3 interim hearings on the Hawaii Family Court; and
4

5 WHEREAS, the Senate Committee on Human Services formed a
6 task force to explore issues related to, among other things,
7 alternative dispute resolution in the Family Court; and
8

9 WHEREAS, Family Court Rule 53.1 grants judges discretion to
10 order the parties to participate in an alternative dispute
11 resolution process, subject to conditions set by the court; and
12

13 WHEREAS, the Committee found that the experience for many
14 Family Court participants is adversarial and litigious and that,
15 despite evidence that children recover more quickly from a
16 parent's divorce or separation when less emotional trauma is
17 associated with the process, some parties are either unwilling
18 or unable to work together to minimize the effects of a family
19 court action on their children; and
20

21 WHEREAS, in fiscal year 2004, over 32,000 cases were filed
22 in the Family Court, including more than 5,500 divorce actions,
23 for a total caseload of 49,880 cases; and
24

25 WHEREAS, although the majority of divorces pending in
26 fiscal year 2004 were concluded on the uncontested divorce
27 calendar without a hearing, judicial resources remain strained
28 in the family court; and
29

30 WHEREAS, the Superior Court of Arizona, Family Court
31 Department of Maricopa County, Arizona is a model for innovative
32 family court programs that maximize limited judicial resources
33 and for streamlined, user-friendly court processes; and
34



1 WHEREAS, the Maricopa County Family Court implemented a
2 variety of new procedures and programs after a study identified
3 the lack of a uniform case management system and the resultant
4 backlog of cases as the two most egregious problems facing the
5 family court; and

6
7 WHEREAS, the Presiding Judge of the Maricopa County Family
8 Court collaborated with family court judges and staff to develop
9 and implement a uniform case management system to streamline the
10 family court process and eliminate the backlog and delay
11 plaguing the court; and

12
13 WHEREAS, the Maricopa County Family Court has implemented a
14 differentiated case management model that employs the following
15 elements: early active judicial management, a focus on final
16 resolution, required litigant preparation for conferences,
17 targeted use of ancillary referrals, early firm trial dates, and
18 user-friendly processes to manage and resolve each category of
19 family court cases in a uniform manner; and

20
21 WHEREAS, in an effort to make the family court process more
22 convenient for litigants and to expedite the entry of a default
23 or consent decree, the Maricopa County Family Court created an
24 innovative program known as the Decree on Demand program; and

25
26 WHEREAS, the Decree on Demand program enables parties to
27 answer questions designed to verify that all legal requirements
28 appear to have been satisfied and schedule a hearing at their
29 convenience, as early as the next court day, by calling a
30 dedicated telephone line or using the Internet; and

31
32 WHEREAS, specially-trained family court staff conduct a
33 final file review prior to the Decree on Demand hearing, to
34 examine final paperwork, to allow litigants to correct any
35 deficiencies that can be cured with available forms, and to
36 calculate child support prior to a hearing with a Court
37 Commissioner; and

38
39 WHEREAS, the Maricopa County Family Court also implemented
40 the Early Resolution Triage Program to aid self-represented
41 parties in contested cases to obtain a full and final settlement
42 of all issues if possible, to assist the parties to memorialize
43 all agreements, and to facilitate the entry of a Consent Decree
44 if the parties reach full agreement; and



1 WHEREAS, under the Early Resolution Triage Program,
2 contested self-represented cases in which a response is filed
3 are scheduled for an Early Resolution Conference with an
4 Attorney Case Manager, who is an attorney trained to mediate and
5 conduct settlement conferences in family court cases; and
6

7 WHEREAS, Attorney Case Managers also manage unresolved
8 custody and child support issues, evaluate the need for
9 pre-trial custody and child support services, initiate referrals
10 and services appropriate to prepare the case for trial, and
11 determine if cases involve complex issues or will require
12 additional trial time that may involve judicial management by
13 the judicial officer assigned to the case; and
14

15 WHEREAS, the Maricopa County Family Court philosophy of
16 early intervention, encouraging settlement, and maximizing
17 judicial resources through targeted ancillary service referrals
18 with the underlying objective to do no harm, is suited to
19 incorporation into Hawaii's Family Court system; now, therefore,
20

21 BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Representatives of the
22 Twenty-third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session
23 of 2006, the Senate concurring, that the Judiciary is requested
24 to identify the programs and processes it has adopted to improve
25 the provision of its services since the conclusion of the
26 interim hearings held pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 40,
27 Regular Session of 2004; and
28

29 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Family Court further is
30 requested to assess its current case management system and to
31 determine which programs and court processes of the Maricopa
32 County Family Court, if any, should be implemented by Hawaii's
33 Family Court; and
34

35 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Judiciary is requested to
36 report its findings to the Legislature no later than twenty days
37 before the convening of the Regular Session of 2007; and
38

39 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that certified copies of this
40 Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the Chief Justice of the

1 Hawaii Supreme Court, the Senior Judge of the Family Court, and
2 the Administrative Director of the Courts.

3
4
5

OFFERED BY: Ali G. Gustafson

MAR 15 2006

