HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION	bill analysis	5/9/2001	HB 284 P. King (CSHB 284 by Bosse)
SUBJECT:	Rules for justice and	small claims court	
COMMITTEE:	Civil Practices — committee substitute recommended		
VOTE:	6 ayes — Bosse, Janek, Clark, Hope, Martinez Fischer, Nixon		
	1 nay — Zbranek		
	2 absent — Dutton, S	Smithee	
WITNESSES:	For — John H. Williams, Constable Association of Texas		
	Against — None		
BACKGROUND:	by justices of the pea small claims court for peace. The rules for Procedure, part 5, ru make an answer to a	ace. Government Code, or each county, also pres justice courts are contai les 523-592a. The rules	courts, which are presided over ch. 28 establishes at least one ided over by the justice of the ned in the Texas Rules of Civil set the time a defendant must small claims courts at 10 days mplaint.
DIGEST:	answer to a suit filed days after the Monda would modify the ru- sued in justice court citation to the defend sworn answer. The m (<i>i.e.</i> , eviction) cases, amend or adopt rules	I in justice and small cla ay following service of the les for the citation that m to include a statement ex- dant and that certain kind new rules would not apple and the Supreme Court is that conflicted with the	001, and would apply only to
SUPPORTERS SAY:		ice and small claims cou d parties rarely hired an	rt used to be very informal and attorney. However, the

HB 284 House Research Organization page 2

	jurisdiction of justice courts has expanded, so that the cases these courts hear are more complex and more likely to require an attorney. Both of these factors justify increasing the amount of time for a defendant to answer a complaint. Increasing the time to answer to match the time permitted in county and district courts would be appropriate and fair.
OPPONENTS SAY:	It would set a bad precedent to remove current rules for justice courts, which properly are left to the Texas Supreme Court's rulemaking process, from the court's purview. The court's rulemaking procedure allows for broader input from attorneys, judges, and legal scholars than does the legislative process, which leads to better rules.
NOTES:	The committee substitute eliminated the original bill's requirement that the defendant's answer be in writing.