



GUIDELINES ON CONDUCTING REMOTE VIDEO DEPOSITIONS AND EXAMINATIONS FOR DISCOVERY

Advocacy in the 21st Century Committee

Approved by the Board of Regents
February 2021

MISSION STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF TRIAL LAWYERS

The American College of Trial Lawyers is an invitation only fellowship of exceptional trial lawyers of diverse backgrounds from the United States and Canada. The College thoroughly investigates each nominee for admission and selects only those who have demonstrated the very highest standards of trial advocacy, ethical conduct, integrity, professionalism and collegiality. The College maintains and seeks to improve the standards of trial practice, professionalism, ethics, and the administration of justice through education and public statements on important legal issues relating to its mission. The College strongly supports the independence of the judiciary, trial by jury, respect for the rule of law, access to justice, and fair and just representation of all parties to legal proceedings.



“In this select circle, we find pleasure and charm in the illustrious company of our contemporaries and take the keenest delight in exalting our friendships.”

—Hon. Emil Gumpert,
Chancellor-Founder, ACTL

American College of Trial Lawyers
1300 Dove Street, Suite 150
Newport Beach, California 92660
Telephone: (949) 752-1801
Website: www.actl.com
Email: nationaloffice@actl.com

Copyright © 2021
American College of Trial Lawyers
All Rights Reserved.

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF TRIAL LAWYERS

CHANCELLOR-FOUNDER

Hon. Emil Gumpert
(1895-1982)

OFFICERS

RODNEY ACKER, *President*
MICHAEL L. O'DONNELL, *President-Elect*
SUSAN J. HARRIMAN, *Treasurer*
WILLIAM J. MURPHY, *Secretary*
DOUGLAS R. YOUNG, *Immediate Past President*

BOARD OF REGENTS

PETER AKMAJIAN

Tucson, Arizona

LARRY H. KRANTZ

New York, New York

SUSAN S. BREWER

Morgantown, West Virginia

GREGORY M. LEDERER

Cedar Rapids, Iowa

JOE R. CALDWELL, JR.

Washington, District of Columbia

MARTIN F. MURPHY

Boston, Massachusetts

JOHN A. DAY

Brentwood, Tennessee

LYN P. PRUITT

Little Rock, Arkansas

RICHARD H. DEANE, JR.

Atlanta, Georgia

CATHERINE M. RECKER

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

MONA T. DUCKETT, Q.C.

Edmonton, Alberta

MICHAEL J. SHEPARD

San Francisco, California

DAN S. FOLLUO

Tulsa, Oklahoma

JEFFREY E. STONE

Chicago, Illinois

SANDRA A. FORBES

Toronto, Ontario

DENNIS J. MAGGI, CAE, Executive Director

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF TRIAL LAWYERS

PAST PRESIDENTS

1950-51 EMIL GUMPERT* Los Angeles, California	1974- AUSTIN W. LEWIS* New Orleans, Louisiana	1998-99 E. OSBORNE AYSCUE, JR. Charlotte, North Carolina
1951-52 C. RAY ROBINSON* Merced, California	1975-76 THOMAS E. DEACY, JR.* Kansas City, Missouri	1999-2000 MICHAEL E. MONE* Boston, Massachusetts
1952-53 CODY FOWLER* Tampa, Florida	1976-77 SIMON H. RIFKIND* New York, New York	2000-2001 EARL J. SILBERT Washington, District of Columbia
1953-54 E. D. BRONSON* San Francisco, California	1977-78 KRAFT W. EIDMAN* Houston, Texas	2001-2002 STUART D. SHANOR Roswell, New Mexico
1954-55 CODY FOWLER* Tampa, Florida	1978-79 MARCUS MATTSON* Los Angeles, California	2002-2003 WARREN B. LIGHTFOOT Birmingham, Alabama
1955-56 WAYNE E. STICHTER* Toledo, Ohio	1979-80 JAMES E. S. BAKER* Chicago, Illinois	2003-2004 DAVID W. SCOTT, Q.C.* Ottawa, Ontario
1956-57 JESSE E. NICHOLS* Oakland, California	1980-81 JOHN C. ELAM* Columbus, Ohio	2004-2005 JAMES W. MORRIS, III* Richmond, Virginia
1957-58 LEWIS C. RYAN* Syracuse, New York	1981-82 ALSTON JENNINGS* Little Rock, Arkansas	2005-2006 MICHAEL A. COOPER* New York, New York
1958-59 ALBERT E. JENNER, JR.* Chicago, Illinois	1982-83 LEON SILVERMAN* New York, New York	2006-2007 DAVID J. BECK Houston, Texas
1959-60 SAMUEL P. SEARS* Boston, Massachusetts	1983-84 GAEL MAHONY* Boston, Massachusetts	2007-2008 MIKEL L. STOUT Wichita, Kansas
1960-61 LON HOCKER* Woods Hole, Massachusetts	1984-85 GENE W. LAFITTE* New Orleans, Louisiana	2008-2009 JOHN J. (JACK) DALTON Atlanta, Georgia
1961-62 LEON JAWORSKI* Houston, Texas	1985-86 GRIFFIN B. BELL* Atlanta, Georgia	2009-2010 JOAN A. LUKEY Boston, Massachusetts
1962-63 GRANT B. COOPER* Los Angeles, California	1986-87 R. HARVEY CHAPPELL, JR.* Richmond, Virginia	2010-2011 GREGORY P. JOSEPH New York, New York
1963-64 WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR* New York, New York	1987-88 MORRIS HARRELL* Dallas, Texas	2011-2012 THOMAS H. TONGUE Portland, Oregon
1964-65 BERNARD G. SEGAL* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	1988-89 PHILIP W. TONE* Chicago, Illinois	2012-2013 CHILTON DAVIS VARNER Atlanta, Georgia
1965-66 EDWARD L. WRIGHT* Little Rock, Arkansas	1989-90 RALPH I. LANCASTER, JR.* Portland, Maine	2013-2014 ROBERT L. BYMAN Chicago, Illinois
1966-67 FRANK G. RAICHLE* Buffalo, New York	1990-91 CHARLES E. HANGER* San Francisco, California	2014-2015 FRANCIS M. WIKSTROM Salt Lake City, Utah
1967-68 JOSEPH A. BALL* Long Beach, California	1991-92 ROBERT B. FISKE, JR. New York, New York	2015-2016 MICHAEL W. SMITH Richmond, Virginia
1968-69 ROBERT W. MESERVE* Boston, Massachusetts	1992-93 FULTON HAIGHT* Santa Monica, California	2016-2017 BARTHOLOMEW J. DALTON Wilmington, Delaware
1969-70 HON. LEWIS F. POWELL, JR.* Washington, District of Columbia	1993-94 FRANK C. JONES* Atlanta, Georgia	2017-2018 SAMUEL H. FRANKLIN Birmingham, Alabama
1970-71 BARNABAS F. SEARS* Chicago, Illinois	1994-95 LIVELY M. WILSON* Louisville, Kentucky	2018-2019 JEFFREY S. LEON, LSM Toronto, Ontario
1971-72 HICKS EPTON* Wewoka, Oklahoma	1995-96 CHARLES B. RENFREW* San Francisco, California	2019-2020 DOUGLAS R. YOUNG San Francisco, California
1972-73 WILLIAM H. MORRISON* Portland, Oregon	1996-97 ANDREW M. COATS Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	
1973-74 ROBERT L. CLARE, JR.* New York, New York	1997-98 EDWARD BRODSKY* New York, New York	

* Deceased

ADVOCACY IN THE 21ST CENTURY COMMITTEE

CHAIR

JOHN A. DAY
Brentwood, TN

VICE CHAIR

ROSLYN J. LEVINE, Q.C.
TORONTO, ON

MEMBERS

JAMES O. BROCCOLETTI
NORFOLK, VA

JOE R. CALDWELL, JR.
WASHINGTON, DC

MONA T. DUCKETT, Q.C.
EDMONTON, AB

SANDRA A. FORBES
TORONTO, ON

NANCY GERTNER
CAMBRIDGE, MA

BRIAN J. GOVER
TORONTO, ON

JEFFERSON M. GRAY
BALTIMORE, MD

MELINDA HAAG
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE DAVID C. HARRIS
VANCOUVER, BC

NAN M. HORVAT
DES MOINES, IA

HON. BARBARA M. G. LYNN
DALLAS, TX

THE HON. MR. JUSTICE FRANK MARROCCO
TORONTO, ON

SHARON L. MCCARTHY
NEW YORK, NY

KATHRYN N. NESTER
SAN DIEGO, CA

CLAIRE J. RAUSCHER
CHARLOTTE, NC

CATHERINE M. RECKER
PHILADELPHIA, PA

LOU ANNA RED CORN
LEXINGTON, KY

PAUL MARK SANDLER
BALTIMORE, MD

LEON F. SPIES
IOWA CITY, IA

SYLVIA H. WALBOLT
TAMPA, FL

HON. JACK ZOUHARY
TOLEDO, OH

GUIDELINES ON REMOTE VIDEO DEPOSITIONS AND EXAMINATIONS FOR DISCOVERY¹

The American College of Trial Lawyers recognizes the impact COVID-19 is having on the ability of judges and lawyers to do the important tasks of the discovery process that aid in the resolution of civil disputes. Many jurisdictions are using or considering the use of remote video to conduct motions hearings and nonjury trials. The use of remote video to take depositions and conduct examinations for discovery² is also underway.

In cases pending in federal courts of the United States, remote depositions utilizing remote video may well be permitted:

FRCP 30(b) (4) ...“By Remote Means. The parties may stipulate—or the court may on motion order—that a deposition be taken by telephone or other remote means. For the purpose of this rule..., the deposition takes place where the deponent answers the questions.”

State and province rules vary, and thus stipulations or agreements by counsel or court orders may be necessary to conduct a deposition or examination using remote video technology while assuring compliance with applicable rules, e.g. administering the oath remotely. To the extent that existing rules do not permit remote video depositions, the College expects that the COVID-19 experience will cause states and provinces to review their rules of procedure and consider amendments to address when depositions by remote video are permitted.

For purposes of this document, the term “remote video deposition/examination” assumes that the witness, examining lawyer(s), witness’ lawyer (if any), and court reporter are each in separate locations. There may be others (associates, paralegals, technicians, experts, etc.) in the same location as an examining lawyer or court reporter but it is assumed that the witness will be in a room alone.

The ACTL Task Force on Advocacy in the 21st Century has gathered policies, procedures, orders, and other input from lawyers in the United States and Canada in an effort to assemble the wisdom and experience of others on the use of taking depositions and examinations via remote video. These Guidelines endeavor to focus the attention of the Bench and Bar on issues that must be considered when conducting depositions and examinations by remote video. Not all of these issues are applicable to every deposition or examination in which remote video is used, but it is suggested that each of them bears consideration in an effort to reduce the chance of confusion, intra-deposition/examination disputes and the need for court intervention during a deposition/examination, and to increase the likelihood that the deposition/examination will be fair to all parties and their counsel.

1 Readers are (a) encouraged to provide feedback about their experiences with these and other ideas for addressing the issues identified in the Interim Guideline; and (b) continue to visit the College website to see the latest version of the document. Please email comments, orders, rules, etc. on this topic to advocacy@actl.com.

2 To enhance readability, the word “depositions” will be used to refer both to “examinations under oath” (used in the Canadian judicial system) and “depositions” (as used in the United States judicial system).

Deposition/examination rules and traditions vary among jurisdictions, but most lawyers and all judges agree that the orderly, efficient progression of discovery in general and deposition/examination-taking in particular works best when counsel work together in good faith to develop a discovery plan appropriate for the case. Nothing in this document suggests that any other course of action is preferable, much less desirable. Instead, this document sets forth issues for the lawyers to discuss and agree among themselves on how to conduct depositions/examinations by remote video and, if they cannot, to guide the court on how to address the issues raised by use of remote video.

A Written Plan should be agreed upon or Court Order obtained to address how remote video depositions/examinations will be conducted.

Some jurisdictions will develop, via administrative court order or local rule, a standing plan for depositions/examinations using remote video. Some lawyers will not have the benefit of such a plan and will have to develop an understanding with other counsel on the matter on a case-by-case basis, preferably confirmed in a writing.

1. Planning for a remote video deposition/examination should include discussion of (a) the video platform that will be used, (b) who will be responsible for managing the video platform during the deposition/examination and his or her duties, (c) whether the video recording at the deposition shall be deemed the equivalent of a video deposition by a videographer, available for use at trial pursuant to applicable rules of procedure and evidence, and (d) confirm that the applicable rules of civil procedure shall determine what constitutes the official record of the deposition.

There are a multitude of video platforms available, some of which are used in circumstances other than depositions/examinations (*e.g.*, Zoom) and others designed for depositions/examinations which are used primarily by court reporters.

Typically, the court reporting vendor will have a technician (the “Video Manager”) control the platform during the deposition/examination. The Video Manager will (a) open the platform for an equipment check at least fifteen minutes before the deposition/examination is scheduled to begin; (b) work with the parties and counsel to identify and correct any video or audio issues before the deposition/examination; (c) monitor the deposition/examination in real-time for video or audio issues; (d) monitor the recording of the video and audio, going on and off the record as appropriate; (e) promptly bring to the attention of the participants any connectivity issues between the platform and any participant; (f) assist any party or the witness with video, audio, and screen sharing issues that arise during the deposition/examination; and (g) coordinate the distribution of the video of the deposition/examination with the court reporting vendor.

2. Planning should include a discussion of whether (a) all lawyers participating in the deposition/examination should be “on camera” for the entire deposition/examination (excluding breaks); (b) the deponent should be “on camera” for the entire deposition/examination (excluding breaks); (c) any other person (party, observer, or non-examining lawyer) should be on camera; and (d) everyone other than the witness, examining party, court reporter and Video Manager should have his or her microphone muted unless it becomes necessary to object or otherwise raise an issue during the deposition/examination. No person

other than the parties, their respective counsel, and counsel for the deponent can attend the deposition without consent of all counsel or as permitted by rules of court.

3. Planning should include a discussion of who should monitor the platform for loss of connectivity with one or more participants and whether the deposition/examination should be stopped if that occurs. The Plan should provide that the deposition should not proceed if technology fails or a deponent or counsel cannot hear questions or answers in the deposition.

4. Planning should include a discussion of how the participants can immediately contact one another in the event of one or more participants loses connection with the platform.

5. An understanding should be reached, if not provided by a court order or rules, that the deponent can give an oath or affirmation remotely on camera, administered by the court reporter regardless of the reporter's location, and that the parties and participants will not challenge the validity of the oath or affirmation for any reason.

6. An understanding should be reached on whether one or all of the following will apply to the remote video deposition/examination:

a. Whether the deponent may send or receive any text, email or other messages that in any way concern the subject matters of his or her testimony or that relate in any way to his or her role as a witness in the proceeding during the deposition.

b. Whether the deponent may consult any social media site (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, Linked In, etc.) for any purpose from the beginning of his or her testimony until it is complete.

c. The application of any law, local rules or customs about whether the deponent may discuss the subject matter of his or her testimony with any person from the beginning of his or her testimony until it is complete, except with the witness' counsel as appropriate for purposes of discussions over whether a privilege should be invoked and as otherwise appropriate by law and local custom).

d. The application of any law, local rules or customs about what materials (other than those presented by examining counsel), if any, the deponent may review during the deposition or examination.

e. Whether the deponent will be permitted to do any Internet or other research during the deposition or examination.

f. Whether a witness who uses documents or notes during the deposition will be required to share those items with all counsel upon request.

g. An agreement that the deponent will not take any action to turn off the camera or disrupt the internet connection between the camera/ computer and the platform unless instructed by counsel on camera to do so.

h. An agreement that the deponent and all counsel will keep a phone readily available to receive a telephone call in the event of a technological interruption during his or her testimony, or any time during the proceeding, including but not limited to colloque between counsel.

7. An understanding should be reached on the responsibilities of the lawyer for the party deponent.

For example, the lawyer for the deponent may be charged with the responsibility to have a computer, camera, and appropriate Internet connection to allow the deponent to be deposed using remote video on the selected platform. The lawyer may also be charged with the responsibility to familiarize the deponent on how the camera operates and how to otherwise interact with the platform, including the screenshare function.

As in a traditional deposition, the deponent's lawyer should not communicate with the deponent during the deposition about the subject matter of the deposition, except if necessary, to invoke privilege or address technology issues. Whether the deponent's lawyer can discuss the subject matter of the deposition with the deponent during off-camera breaks should remain subject to local rules and customs.

8. An understanding should be reached on the responsibilities of the lawyer who is deposing a witness, who will not be represented by a lawyer at the deposition/examination.

For example, the lawyer who is deposing a person who is not represented by counsel may be given the responsibility to have a computer, camera, and appropriate Internet connection to allow the deponent to be deposed using remote video on the selected platform. The lawyer may also be given the responsibility to reasonably attempt to familiarize the deponent on how the camera operates and how to otherwise interact with the platform, including the screenshare function. The lawyer may also be given the responsibility to instruct the witness on the agreed-upon rules for the deposition concerning handling documents, communicating with others during the deposition, etc.

9. An understanding should be reached on the responsibilities of lawyer participants generally.

It is anticipated that most lawyers would agree that the following responsibilities should apply to lawyers participating in remote video depositions/examinations.

a. Reasonably cooperate with one another and with self-represented parties in the creation of a Plan.

b. Become familiar with the technology that will be used for the deposition/examination, understand how it works, and, where possible, have the necessary hardware and software to participate meaningfully. Hardware and software should be tested before the hearing so that any glitches can be identified and resolved.

c. Cooperate with other counsel, self-represented parties, the court reporter, and the Video Manager during the deposition/examination.

d. Obey the law, local rules, and customs about when it is appropriate to communicate with the witness.

e. Work with other counsel and self-represented parties to ease any burden technology places on other counsel or another party and not use technological challenges or glitches to take advantage of another lawyer or party.

f. Determine whether any party, lawyer or deponent has a disability that prevents or impairs his or her ability to participate in a deposition that includes the use of remote video and include provisions that will permit the person to fully participate in the deposition.

10. An understanding should be reached on a protocol for handling exhibits during the remote video deposition/examination.

The parties may agree to handle documents expected to be referenced during the deposition/examination in multiple ways and should set forth any agreement reached on the issue in writing. In the absence of an agreement, the Court may be required to select a manner for handling exhibits.

The discovery rules in Canada are very different from those in the United States (and indeed they may vary from province to province). Nothing in these Guidelines should be interpreted to suggest that counsel or parties should not disclose those documents that they are required by law or rule to disclose at the time when they are required to disclose them.

That said, unless a law or rule requires something different, in a traditional deposition in the United States there is not a mandatory pre-deposition exchange of documents to be used by one examiner or another in the deposition. To be sure, there is a universe (however large or small) of documents that well-prepared lawyers and witnesses understand may be used during the deposition/examination, but examining counsel are not required to tell a witness or her counsel what documents will be referenced in what order during the deposition/examination. The fact the deposition/examination is being taken utilizing remote video should not change that practice.

To the extent that there are documents to be submitted to the deponent during the deposition/examination, the document can be screen-shared during the deposition/examination and, as appropriate, be marked as an exhibit or an exhibit for identification only (as appropriate). A document which is screen-shared should be described on the record with sufficient particularity that any person familiar with the case can readily identify it. (*E.g.* “This is page one from a two-page letter from Smith to Jones dated Jan. 2, 2020 bearing identification numbers P00122 and P00123.” Then, absent an agreement to the contrary, the entire document should be uploaded using the in-meeting file transfer feature of the video platform to all counsel, the court reporter, the Video Manager, and the witness. Counsel and self-represented parties should confirm on the record that each received a copy of the uploaded document. The witness and the witness’ lawyer have the right to review the images of the entire document (not just the page offered by the examining lawyer via screen share) before being asked questions about the page or the document. Whether the entire document or just the page or pages which are screen-shared are marked as an exhibit will depend on the rules and customs of the

jurisdiction and any agreement among counsel. The court reporter has the responsibility to manage the referenced documents and to mark them as exhibits as requested.

There are other acceptable alternatives that may be considered. For example, the parties may agree to confidentially share the proposed exhibits with the court reporter before the deposition. The parties may agree to email any proposed exhibit to the participants before questioning the deponent about it. The parties may agree to upload the proposed exhibits into a password protected digital lockbox, sharing the password at the beginning of the deposition/examination.

If a document is created during the testimony (e.g. a diagram of the scene of an incident), or if markings are placed on an exhibit during testimony and a party wants to offer the created or marked document as an exhibit, the party shall do so in the traditional fashion and then, through the use of the “in-meeting file transfer” feature of the platform or other agreed method, send a copy of the document to each party, the Court (if required by local rules), the Video Manager, and the court reporter. Counsel and self-represented parties shall confirm on the record that each received a copy of the uploaded document. The court reporter will mark any such exhibit as requested.

To the extent that oversize (plats, construction drawings, spreadsheets, etc.) documents or physical objects will be used or will be sought to be made exhibits the parties should include in the Plan a method for using them during the deposition/examination and delivering them to the court reporter for inclusion in the official record of the deposition/examination.

If a true “original” needs to be made an exhibit to the deposition/examination, the parties should agree on the record who will maintain the “original” document after the deposition/examination. The parties may agree that a copy of the “original” may be substituted for the “original” as an exhibit to the deposition/examination with the “original” maintained by a designated person.

Finally, it should be noted that some court reporters have specialized video platforms that permit enhanced document markup, x-ray and MRI markup, importation of maps, various recording capabilities, touch display, etc. A discussion about which video platform will be used by the parties may include a discussion of this type of enhanced platform.

11. If raised by a participant, an understanding should be reached on whether any person can be in the same room as the deponent.

A deponent may want his or her counsel physically present at the time of the deposition/examination. Likewise, the examining lawyer may want to “look the deponent in the eye” and insist on being physically present, as might one or more of the other lawyers participating in the deposition/examination. The deponent’s lawyer, who otherwise sees no need to be physically present in the room with the deponent, may then insist on being present to prevent any chance of harassment by the examining lawyer. A multitude of other scenarios exist, the effect of which is that what was intended by the person seeking a remote video deposition is converted into a hybrid deposition, with some participants physically present in one location with the deponent and others in other locations.

These issues present the classic situation where the parties should work together in good faith to reach an agreement that meets the legitimate concerns of all of those that will be

involved in the deposition/examination. If they cannot agree, a court will be required to resolve the dispute, considering not only the interests of the parties but also that of the public in securing a just, speedy, and inexpensive resolution of the case.

American College of Trial Lawyers
Phone: 949-752-1801
Website: www.actl.com
Email: nationaloffice@actl.com