

Minutes of the Meeting
Rules Committee of the Superior Court
Monday, January 12, 2026

On January 12, 2026, the Rules Committee met using *Microsoft Teams* from 2:00 p.m. to 3:02 p.m.

Members in attendance were:

HON. WILLIAM H. BRIGHT, JR., CHAIR
HON. BARBARA AARON
HON. BARRY F. ARMATA
HON. KEVIN C. DOYLE
HON. ERNEST GREEN
HON. CHRISTOPHER A. H. GRIFFIN
HON. JENNIFER MACIEROWSKI
HON. JESSICA TORRES
HON. THOMAS J. WELCH

Also in attendance were Lori Petruzzelli, Counsel to the Rules Committee, James T. O'Connor, Assistant Counsel to the Rules Committee, and Jillian Greenbacker, Assistant Counsel to the Rules Committee.

1. The Committee approved the minutes of the meeting held on December 15, 2025. Judge Macierowski abstained from voting.
2. The Committee considered a proposal from Attorney Zenas Zelotes that would require attorneys who use Artificial Intelligence (AI) programs to conduct legal research to append a certification to their pleadings and/or briefs that they have independently verified the accuracy of the citations therein (RC ID # [2023-011](#)).

The Committee also considered an informational memorandum from Attorney Kevin DiAdamo concerning Public Acts 2023, No. 23-16, and Artificial Intelligence technology generally (RC ID # 2023-014).

Justice Bright presented a draft to the Committee of a proposal for new Section 4-9, Generative Artificial Intelligence (“Generative A.I.”) Certification. After discussion, the Committee voted to refer the matter for comments to the Connecticut Bar Association (CBA), the Connecticut Trial Lawyers Association (CTLA), the Connecticut Criminal Defense Lawyers Association (CDLA), Statewide Legal Services, Court Operations and Chief Administrative Judges Barbara Bellis, Leo Diana, Tammy Nguyen-O’Dowd, and Robin Pavia. Justice Bright will work with Judge Armata and Judicial Legal Services on a revised draft to be presented at the February meeting.

3. The Committee considered a proposal by Justice McDonald regarding the propriety of a party having ex parte communications with a disclosed expert witness of an opposing party and whether any changes to the rules in this subject area are necessary or appropriate (RC ID # [2024-009](#)).

Judge Aaron presented a draft to the Committee of a proposal from the working group studying this matter to amend Section 13-4.

Judge Tammy Nguyen-O’Dowd, Chief Administrative Judge for Juvenile Matters, and Attorney Sarah R. Russell addressed the Committee.

After discussion, the Committee tabled this matter until its February meeting to give the working group an opportunity to confer with Judge Nguyen-O’Dowd to revise the draft proposal of Section 13-4.

4. The Committee considered a proposal from Donna Boynton to amend Section 7-19 to specify that a self-represented litigant may subpoena witnesses to depositions (RC ID # [2025-009](#)).

Attorney Jillian Greenbacker addressed the Committee.

After discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to submit to public hearing the proposal to amend Section 7-19, as set forth in Appendix A.

5. The Committee considered a proposal from Attorney James Sullivan for a new rule concerning notification to clients when a lawyer leaves a law firm (RC ID # [2025-011](#)).

Attorney Marcy Stovall addressed the Committee.

After discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to take no further action on this matter by removing it from future agendas.

6. The Committee considered a proposal from Gwen Samuel to require professional liability insurance for attorneys (RC ID # [2025-014](#)).

Attorney Christopher Slack, Statewide Bar Counsel, Attorney Sarah R. Russell, and Attorney Emily Gianquinto addressed the Committee.

After discussion, Judge Welch volunteered to head a working group with Judges Armata and Green to study the matter and to provide the Committee with a status report at the February meeting.

7. The Committee considered a proposal to amend Sections 2-38 and 2-47n in light of the decision in *Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel v. Vaccaro* (SC 21047), to clarify the appellate procedure when the reviewing committee directs a presentment pursuant to Section 2-47 (d) (1) (RC ID # [2025-020](#)).

Attorney Christopher Slack, Statewide Bar Counsel, addressed the Committee. After discussion, the matter was tabled to give Attorney Slack and Chief Disciplinary Counsel Attorney Brian Staines the opportunity to draft proposed amendments and to

provide the Committee with a status update of their progress before the end of the Committee term.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Petruzzelli
Counsel to the Rules Committee

APPENDIX A

(011226)

Sec. 7-19. Issuing Subpoenas for Witnesses on Behalf of Self-Represented Litigants

(a) Self-represented litigants seeking to compel the attendance of necessary witnesses in connection with the hearing of any matter shall file an application to have the clerk of the court issue subpoenas for that purpose. The application shall include a summary of the expected testimony of each proposed witness so that the court may determine the relevance of the testimony. The clerk, after verifying the scheduling of the matter, shall present the application to the judge before whom the matter is scheduled for hearing, or the administrative judge or any judge designated by the administrative judge if the matter has not been scheduled before a specific judge, which judge shall review the application.

(b) The reviewing judge may act on the application ex parte and may direct or deny the issuance of subpoenas as such judge deems warranted under the circumstances, keeping in mind the nature of the scheduled hearing and future opportunities for examination of witnesses, as may be appropriate. If an application is granted ex parte, in whole or in part, any party may file a motion for protective order or motion to quash, as appropriate. If an application is denied ex parte, in whole or in part, the applicant may request a hearing which shall be scheduled by the court. The reviewing judge may order that an application acted upon ex parte be placed in the official court file, whether or not a hearing is requested.

(c) If the reviewing judge does not act on the application ex parte, such judge shall direct that the application be placed in the official court file to allow any party to file an objection, which objection will be filed by a date to be set by the reviewing judge. Having provided an opportunity for any party to object, the reviewing judge may direct or deny the issuance of subpoenas as such judge deems warranted under the circumstances, keeping in mind the nature of the scheduled hearing and future opportunities for examination of witnesses, as may be appropriate.

(d) Any party or nonparty to whom a subpoena is directed pursuant to this rule may file a motion to quash or a motion for protective order as appropriate.

(e) Self-represented litigants seeking to compel the attendance of witnesses in connection with a deposition shall do so consistent with Sections 13-26 through 13-28, 25-31, 34a-20, and 40-44.

COMMENTARY: The revisions to this section clarify that a self-represented litigant may file an application with the clerk of the court to issue subpoenas for depositions. This section should be read together with the requirements of Sections 13-26 through 13-28, 25-31, 34a-20, and 40-44, concerning depositions in civil, family, juvenile and criminal matters, as may be applicable.