

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON MODERN BUSINESS COURTS AND THE BAR'S ROLE IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT

by

LEE APPLEBAUM

The modern American business court movement formally began in the early 1990s with the establishment of the business court “pilot parts” in New York and Chicago’s Commercial Calendar. There is now some form of business court in at least 15 states. The chief objectives of these specialized court programs are to develop judicial expertise, reliability and efficiency in handling business to business disputes and intra-corporate disputes, where non-specialized court systems were perceived as unable or unwilling to provide such forums. It is further believed that the creation of such forums decreases overall court backlogs and promotes business development and retention in those venues. The concept, and motivation, are not new.

The “aspirational” model is the Delaware Court of Chancery. To achieve a reputation and quality akin to Chancery is a worthy goal in itself. The practical modern business/commercial court model, however, is broader. Chancery is traditionally a court of equity with limited jurisdiction, hearing business disputes of the intra-corporate type, but not commercial disputes. The goal of having a high quality court hearing both commercial disputes, as well as intra-corporate disputes, reaches back even further than Chancery’s blooming into the nation’s leading business court in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries.

In 1875, a New York Times summary of testimony before a legislative judiciary committee began: “It must be generally admitted that hitherto our legal tribunals have been altogether inadequate to speedily investigate and promptly decide upon purely commercial and business disputes.” *Court of Arbitration, Argument in Favor of the Proposed Amended Act*, New York Times (February 11, 1875). That same witness described “prolonged lawsuits” as “tumors and cancers of businessmen.”

There was a Commercial Court in New Orleans from 1839 to 1846, created by statute. Transfer of cases from “the existing courts to [the] Commercial Court [w]as a way of relieving the burden on the existing courts created by the large number and technical complexity of commercial disputes arising in the city.” *Louisiana Commercial Court (Orleans Parish) Records, 1839-1846*, City Archives, New Orleans Public Library, available at <http://nutrias.org/~nopl/inv/commct.htm>. The New Orleans’ Commercial Court was “also evidently intended to facilitate the speedy resolution of commercial disputes as a way of encouraging the development of commerce in New Orleans.” *Id.*

Outside of the United States, Professor James Munson writes of tribunals of commerce reaching back to roots in 16th Century France, where *juges-consuls* developed their own legal principles and procedures. James R. Munson, *Business Courts and the Business Ethos in Revolutionary France*, Society for French Historical Studies Annual

Meeting, 1993, Chico, California. France's commercial courts even survived the Revolution. Another example of the historical nature of need and response resulting in a business court is Copenhagen's Maritime and Commercial Court, which was established 147 years ago.

Commercial courts are still to be found in Europe, with new development in Central and Eastern Europe, and in some of the old Soviet Republics. Developments in the Middle East, Asia, and most recently the expansion of specialized commercial courts in Africa marks the important role these courts play in national growth, stabilization and hopes. This geographical breadth reflects a common response to widely experienced perceptions of the same realities simultaneously manifesting locally and globally: Commercial disputes need to be handled properly for the entire community's sake; and business courts are an important, and increasingly necessary, component in achieving that end for a city, region or nation interested in healthy commerce. Because of commercial expansion and development on all continents, business courts are neither rare creatures unique to peculiar venues (whether London, New York or Wilmington), nor novelties to be given a go, but willingly abandoned in a few years if things don't work out right away.

Judge Albert Sheppard, ten years a Philadelphia business court judge, succinctly gets to the core of business courts as an expression of local commercial necessity: "City businesses have the comfort of knowing that there is a court that they can go to charged with handling business cases, requiring that the judges be versed in corporate and business law. This promotes a favorable platform for business to operate in our city, without having to go elsewhere." Lee Applebaum, *The Commerce Court's First Decade*, *The Philadelphia Lawyer* 21, 24 (April 2009).

As recently stated by Mr. Justice David Steel of London's Commercial and Admiralty Court, during a gathering of business court judges in Vancouver:

Business or commercial courts have become fashionable. In addition to the more obvious jurisdictions in Western Europe, the Far East and the Americas, they have been established in many countries including such surprising examples as Belarus, Cambodia, Guyana, Indonesia, Qatar and Tanzania. The trend continues. My colleagues and I have been asked for help in creating or bolstering commercial courts in Kazakhstan, Abu Dhabi, Thailand, Nigeria, Malawi and the BVI.

Opening remarks by the The Honorable Mr. Justice David Steel, Business Courts Around the World, ABA Section of Business Law (Vancouver April 17, 2009) (on file with the author). Quoting Adam Smith: "Little else is requisite to carry a state to the highest degree of opulence from the lowest barbarism but peace, easy taxes and a tolerable administration of justice." Id. He adds that "[i]n short, if a country is to be successful in playing its part in the global economy, it must have a credible and effective legal system made up of comprehensive and enforceable commercial code and an independent and experienced judiciary." Id.

Back in the U.S., recent budget cuts have posed threats to business court programs in at least Maine, Rhode Island, Florida, Atlanta and Philadelphia. Business court cases are paper intensive, and may at times call for more support staff, clerks, etc., thus becoming tempting targets for budget cuts. In the larger picture, however, any jurisdiction's overall economic potential suffers from this relatively small savings, if businesses in a jurisdiction lose confidence in a court system that abandons a perceived forum for the rational and efficient resolution of business disputes by seasoned and knowledgeable jurists. This essential role of business courts can only be truly understood if the business court is seen as serving the community first, the judiciary second and lawyers incidentally, *i.e.*, lawyers need to look at these courts not from the tips of our own noses, but with eagles' eyes.

Still, it is the lawyers who will be spending more time on individual business court cases than any judge or litigant, and so the lawyers want to know how such courts work, and how they can be improved. The later point brings out something very interesting about these new business courts: they are often responsive to input from lawyers and adaptable to change over much shorter time periods than the full court system. In some jurisdictions, new bar committees in state bar associations have grown up part and parcel with the creation of local business courts, offering their support and services to these courts. Nationally, the ABA Section of Business Law's Committee on Business and Corporate Litigation created the Subcommittee on Business Courts, which has worked actively with state legislators, executive branch members, judges and lawyers across the country. The Subcommittee has also worked closely with the Business and Commercial Courts Committee of the National Conference of State Trial Judges.

In the words of Robert Haig, a godfather of the modern business courts, business and commercial courts can be laboratories for innovation. In New York, a state once noted for the lack of uniformity in state wide rules from county to county, the Commercial Divisions in the various counties adopted uniform rules, *available at* <http://www.nycourts.gov/rules/trialcourts/202.shtml#70>, something considered a remarkable achievement in light of that individualistic history. In addition, from December 2005 through February 2006, an effort in connection with New York's Commercial Divisions "brought together current and retired judges, prominent commercial litigators and in-house counsel of major corporations for a meaningful dialogue about the Commercial Division." *Report of the Office of Court Administration to the Chief Judge on the Commercial Division Focus Groups* (July 2006), *available at* www.nycourts.gov/reports/ComDivFocusGroupReport.pdf. One result was to identify numerous features of the Commercial Division that could be applied in all civil litigation.

In Boston's Suffolk Superior Court Business Litigation Session, which serves as something of a regional business court, the business judges recently issued new rules giving lawyers clear instruction on reply briefs, when motions for reconsideration are appropriate (and when they are not) and confidentiality agreements. In Philadelphia, the bench and bar worked together to enhance and clarify alternative dispute resolution practices in business court matters. Judge Ben F. Tennille of North Carolina's Business Court, a seminal figure in the nation's development of business courts, Chair of the

Business and Commercial Courts Committee of the National Conference of State Trial Judges of the ABA's Judicial Division, and first President of the American College of Business Court Judges, has been a leading innovator in his state on using technology in all phases of a case. He has also mixed this with sound doses of practical wisdom, such as having clients come to court conferences early in the case to get an understanding of what the litigation will cost, in evaluating whether or not to settle.

These are examples of procedural innovations or developments that improve the court's functioning. All such innovations are designed at making improvements in the litigation and adjudicative process for all concerned. Any lawyer involvement is exemplified by cooperative efforts for mutual benefit, and not lobbying or unilateral efforts to achieve gains for one category of client over another in the typical course of litigation. Thus, to the extent lawyers have a role in the development of business courts, outside of the normal course of practice before the court in an individual, it is in creating a better playing field for all concerned. Myopic efforts to gain a systemic edge for one's clients would almost certainly result in undermining the viability of such courts, but likely would not ever get past the jurists and members of the bar solely focused on the litigants' and court's best interests.

Finally, the dynamic nature of business court evolution is evinced by innovations that have transformed the Delaware Court of Chancery's subject matter jurisdiction. Recognizing the new (competitive) business court environment developing nationally, intending to keep its preeminent reputation, and intending to offer its superb resources to commercial litigants, in 2003 Chancery's jurisdiction was expanded by statute. This included permitting certain commercial disputes in excess of \$1 Million to be litigated in Chancery, and permitting similar types of commercial disputants to utilize the services of the Chancellor or Vice-Chancellors as mediators. More recently, in 2009, Chancery's jurisdiction was again expanded by new legislation to permit the parties in certain cases to seek arbitration before the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellors and/or a Master in Chancery. The point here is that the court many perceive as the nation's leading business court – and some may even say the World's preeminent business court – is adapting and evolving to compete with business courts in sister states.

The role of bar leaders has been integral in the creation of these business courts. It is a role that does not end once the court is created; rather, bar leadership in the maintenance and evolution of business courts remains active. It requires engagement, attention, reflection and, in these hard economic times, vigilance in reminding the community at large about the true importance of business courts.

Lee Applebaum is a partner at Fineman, Krekstein & Harris, P.C. in Philadelphia. He is Co-Chair of the Subcommittee on Business Courts of the ABA Section of Business Law's Committee on Business and Corporate Litigation, and Vice-Chair of the Philadelphia Bar Association's Business Law Section.

Originally Presented on May 13, 2009 at Business Bar Leaders Conference in Chicago, at the meeting sponsored by ABA's Section of Business Law Committee on State and Local Bar Relations

BUSINESS COURT RESOURCE LIST

Prepared by Lee Applebaum

I. BUSINESS COURT AND COMPLEX LITIGATION PROGRAMS (Alphabetical by State)

1. **Arizona**
Superior Court of Maricopa County, Complex Civil Litigation Pilot Program,
<http://www.superiorcourt.maricopa.gov/SuperiorCourt/CivilDepartment/complexLitigation.asp>
2. **California**
Superior Court, Complex Civil Litigation Pilot Program: Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties,
<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/reference/documents/factsheets/comlit.pdf>
Superior Court, Complex Civil Litigation Program, San Mateo County,
http://www.sanmateocourt.org/complex_civil_lit/courtroom_rules_procedure_s.pdf
3. **Connecticut**
Superior Court, Complex Litigation Docket:
Hartford, Stamford and Waterbury,
<http://www.jud.ct.gov/external/super/spsess.htm#ComplexLitigationDocket>
4. **Delaware**
Court of Chancery,
<http://courts.delaware.gov/Courts/Court%20of%20Chancery/>
5. **Florida**
Ninth Judicial Circuit Court (Orlando), Complex Business Litigation Court,
<http://www.ninja9.org/Courts/Business/Index-BC.htm>
Eleventh Judicial Circuit Court (Miami), Complex Business Litigation Section,
http://www.jud11.flcourts.org/programs_and_services/complex_business_litigation.htm
Thirteenth Judicial Circuit Court (Tampa), Complex Business Litigation Division, <http://www.fljud13.org/CBLD.htm>
Seventeenth Judicial Circuit Court (Ft. Lauderdale), Complex Litigation Unit,
http://www.17th.flcourts.org/Complex_Litigation_Unit/complex_litigation_unit.html
6. **Georgia**
Fulton County Superior Court Business Court,
http://sca.fultoncourt.org/superiorcourt/business_po.php

Gwinnett County Judicial Circuit Business Case Division,
http://www.gwinnettcourts.com/#courtsjudges_superior_businesscourt/

7. **Illinois**
Cook County Circuit Court, Commercial Calendar,
<http://www.cookcountycourt.org/divisions/law/CommercialCalendars.asp>
8. **Maine**
Business and Consumer Court,
http://www.courts.state.me.us/maine_courts/specialized/business/index.shtml
9. **Maryland**
Circuit Court, Business and Technology Case Management Program,
Statewide link,
<http://www.courts.state.md.us/businessstech/>
Baltimore, <http://www.baltocts.sailorsite.net/civil/BTCMP/BTCMP.html>
10. **Massachusetts**
Suffolk Superior Court Business Litigation Session (Boston),
<http://www.mass.gov/courts/courtsandjudges/courts/superiorcourt/businesslitigation.html>
11. **Nevada**
Second Judicial District Court, Business Court Docket (Reno)
Eighth Judicial District Court, Business Court Docket (Las Vegas)
General overview, <http://whynevada.com/businesscourts/>
12. **New Jersey**
Superior Court of Bergen County, Complex Commercial Case Pilot Program
Superior Court of Essex County, Complex Commercial Case Pilot Program
Proposed legislation pending on statewide Commercial Division
13. **New York**
Supreme Court Commercial Division: 7th District, 8th District, and Albany,
Kings, Nassau, New York, Onondaga, Queens, Suffolk, Westchester
Counties, <http://www.nycourts.gov/courts/comdiv/>
14. **North Carolina**
Superior Court, North Carolina Business Court,
<http://www.ncbusinesscourt.net/>
15. **Ohio**
Court of Common Pleas, Commercial Docket :
Cuyahoga County (Cleveland), Franklin County (Columbus),
<http://www.fccourts.org/gen/webfront.nsf/wp/bd4e4ee8598b8c71852575190063f50b?OpenDocument&Start=1&Count=30&Expand=4>

Hamilton County (Cincinnati), Lucas County (Toledo),
<http://www.co.lucas.oh.us/CommonPleas/rules.asp#508>
Montgomery County (Dayton)
General information and background on Commercial Docket,
<http://www.sconet.state.oh.us/boards/commDockets/default.asp>

16. Oregon
Second Judicial District (Eugene), Commercial Court Program,
<http://www.ojd.state.or.us/lan/Commercial%20Court/Comm%20Court.htm>
17. Pennsylvania
Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, Commerce Case Management
Program, <http://courts.phila.gov/common-pleas/trial/civil/commerce-program.html>
Allegheny County Court of Common Pleas, Commerce and Complex
Litigation Center,
http://www.alleghencourts.us/civil/commerce_complex_litigation.asp
18. Rhode Island
Superior Court, Business Calendar
19. South Carolina
Circuit Court, Business Court Pilot Program,
<http://www.judicial.state.sc.us/busCourt/>
20. Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Superior Court of Justice, Commercial List,
<http://www.ontariocourts.on.ca/scj/en/commerciallist/index.htm>

II. STATES STUDYING BUSINESS COURTS OR IN THE PROCESS OF IMPLEMENTING BUSINESS COURTS

- 1. Colorado**
Judicial review of possible new business court
- 2. Iowa**
Chief Justice of Iowa Supreme Court has expressed interest in a business court
- 3. Mississippi**
Business Court Study Group has recommended creation of a business court
http://www.sos.state.ms.us/Policy_Research/Policy%20PDF/Recommendations%20and%20executive%20summary.pdf
- 4. New Hampshire**
Superior Court, Business and Commercial Dispute Docket was created and signed into law in 2008, but budgetary constraints are limiting implementation
- 5. Oklahoma**
Statute permitting establishment of business court divisions in the District Courts in Oklahoma City and Tulsa enacted in 2004, but this has not been implemented by Supreme Court
- 6. West Virginia**
Legislative interest

III. SOME RESOURCE SITES ON INTERNET

1. University of Maryland School of Law Journal of Business and Technology Law, State Business Court Resources, including links to numerous business court web sites, studies and articles,
http://www.law.umaryland.edu/academics/journals/jbtl/bus_tech_res.html
2. University of Cincinnati College of Law Commercial Court Project,
http://www.law.uc.edu/academics/corporate_commercialct.shtml
3. National Center for State Courts, Specialized Courts,
<http://www.ncsconline.org/wc/CourTopics/statelinks.asp?id=10>
4. North Carolina Business Litigation Report Blog,
<http://www.ncbusinesslitigationreport.com/>
5. Mississippi Business Court Study Group Survey,
[http://www.sos.state.ms.us/Policy_Research/Policy%20PDF/EXHIBIT%20H%20-%20Survey%20Business%20Courts%20by%20State%20and%20executive%20summary%20\(final%20060208revised\).pdf](http://www.sos.state.ms.us/Policy_Research/Policy%20PDF/EXHIBIT%20H%20-%20Survey%20Business%20Courts%20by%20State%20and%20executive%20summary%20(final%20060208revised).pdf)
6. Mitchell L. Bach and Lee Applebaum, A History of the Creation and Jurisdiction of Business Courts in the Last Decade, 60 Bus. Law. 147 (2004)
http://finemanlawfirm.com/publications/final_online.pdf

This article is supplemented annually by the *Business Courts* Chapter in the *Annual Review of Developments in Business and Corporate Litigation*, a publication of the American Bar Association Section of Business Law's Committee on Business and Corporate Litigation. For those with access to publications on the ABA website, the following years' chapters are available on-line:

2008,

<http://www.abanet.org/abanet/common/login/securedarea.cfm?areaType=premium&role=cl&url=/buslaw/mo/premium-cl/programs/spr08/12/12.pdf>

2006,

<http://www.abanet.org/abanet/common/login/securedarea.cfm?CFID=2480541&CFTOKEN=99016674&jsessionid=0030ccd398e713c1bb6a1544e61716413c49TR&URL=%2Fbuslaw%2Fmo%2Fpremium%2Dcl%2Fprograms%2Fspr06%2F12%2F12%2Epdf&ROLE=cl&AREATYPE=premium>

2005,

<http://www.abanet.org/abanet/common/login/securedarea.cfm?areaType=premium&role=cl&url=/buslaw/mo/premium-cl/programs/spr05/10/10.pdf>

IV. RECENT ARTICLES

1. Steven J. Cleveland, *Process Innovation in the Production of Corporate Law*, 41 U.C. Davis. L. Rev. 1829 (2008)
2. Jens Dammann & Henry Hansmann, *Globalizing Commercial Litigation*, 94 Cornell L. Rev. 1 (2008)
3. Adam Feit, *Developments in the Law: Tort Reform, One State at a Time: Recent Developments in Class Actions and Complex Litigation in New York, Illinois, Texas, and Florida*, 41 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 899 (2008)
4. Ann Tucker Nees, *Making a Case for Business Courts: A survey of and Proposed Framework to Evaluate Business Courts*, 24 Ga. St. U. L. Rev. 477 (2007)
5. Ari Davis, *Moving From Mandatory: Making ADR Voluntary in New York Commercial Division Cases*, 8 Cardozo J. Conflict Resol. 283 (2006)
6. Theodore Eisenberg & Geoffrey Miller, *The Market for Contracts* (N.Y.U. Ctr. for Law & Econ., Law & Econ. Research Paper Series Working Paper No. 06-45, 2006), <http://ssrn.com/abstract=938557>.
7. Maarten J. Kroeze, *The Dutch Companies and Business Court as a Specialized Court*, published in *The Quality of Corporate Law and the Role of Corporate Law Judges* (2006), and available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=976277.
8. Lee Applebaum, *Complex Litigation Courts and Business Courts: Some Brief Observations on Connections and Similarities*, presented at the ABA Section of Business Law Annual Meeting (August 2007), among documents found at, <http://www.abanet.org/buslaw/newsletter/0063/materials/pp3.pdf>

THE “NEW” BUSINESS COURTS

by

Lee Applebaum¹

Lawyer 1: “I’ll say a phrase and you name the first court that comes to mind.”

Lawyer 2: “Ok, go.”

Lawyer 1: “Business Court.”

Lawyer 2: “Delaware Court of Chancery.”

Fifteen years ago, the over two hundred year old Delaware Court of Chancery would have been the *only* response; but today other possibilities exist. If this same word association test was conducted in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston or Charlotte, to name a few cities, the subconscious link from the phrase “business court” would no longer inexorably lead to Delaware.

For nearly 15 years, various states’ trial courts have incorporated specialized business and commercial tracks within their dockets, often starting as pilot programs. Some of these experiments have become institutionalized, with “business courts” operating for over a decade in Manhattan, Chicago and North Carolina. Other business courts -- in Rhode Island, Philadelphia, Las Vegas, Reno, and Boston -- are on their way to the ten year mark; and a new generation has arisen in the last few years.

Delaware’s Court of Chancery remains the bright star in this firmament, and it sets the standard to which other courts aspire: to institutionalize the qualities that make Chancery a great court. Hard work, long development and study of legal issues, intelligence and integrity are the foundation of its excellence, forming the qualitative archetype for the new business courts.

Chancery’s “aspirational model” goes more to the essence than the attributes of these “new” business courts, however, which have taken a distinctly different form. They are not courts of equity focusing on corporate governance and constituency issues, though these issues form part of their jurisdiction. Rather, their jurisdiction covers non-equity actions for money damages, as well as intra-corporate matters that come under traditional equity jurisdiction. Thus, some call these new courts “commercial courts” or “commercial and business courts,” reflecting this broader jurisdictional model that includes both law and equity matters.

Along with not fully capturing this commercial distinction, the rubric “business court” does not precisely describe each state’s jurisdictional development. In most states, the word “court” itself is a misnomer. Rather, specialized dockets or programs with a defined jurisdiction have been created within many states’ trial courts or their civil divisions. Thus, *e.g.*, Philadelphia’s colloquially known “Commerce Court” is actually designated the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas’ Commerce Case Management

¹Lee Applebaum is a Litigation Partner at Fineman, Krekstein & Harris, P.C. in Philadelphia. He is Co-Chair of the Subcommittee on Business Courts in the Section of Business Law’s Business and Corporate Litigation Committee, and has written and spoken extensively on the subject of business and commercial courts.

Program; a case track created by an administrative order assigning two (later three) judges to hear a specific subset of cases taken from the trial court's general docket.

Whatever the name, manner of creation, or breadth as a program or court division, however, the new business courts have one central common ground: a specific set of judges, assigned to hear a body of business and commercial cases, individually handling a case from beginning to end.

Why Business Courts Now?

The modern business courts' popular history goes something like this.

In some significant part, the business court phenomenon arose because business litigants and their counsel wanted to avoid court – more specifically state trial courts. In the early 1990s, commercial litigants' frustration independently reached boiling points in, at least, New York City and Chicago. Unlike federal courts, cases were placed in master calendar systems with the possibility of multiple judges handling different aspects of the same case as the litigation wended its way through the system. This limited optimal case management, and it also limited the development of judicial expertise in the procedural and substantive aspects of commercial and business disputes. Many believed, whether true or not, that this led to an unpredictable, uninformed and unreliable process. Doubt and disrespect were said to be evidenced by lawyers advising their clients to litigate in other venues if at all possible.

In 1993, New York City and Chicago began pilot programs assigning business and commercial disputes to an individual judge for a case's duration. In New York, this has become known as the New York County Supreme Court's Commercial Division, and in Chicago it is the Circuit Court of Cook County Law Division's Commercial Calendar. Even earlier, in 1990, California's State Bar established an ad hoc committee to study the creation of specialized business courts. That effort ended in 1997, with California eventually opting to create pilot programs to address varied forms of complex litigation, whether or not involving business or commercial law, *i.e.*, California created a specialized case management court rather than a specialized subject matter court. This article focuses solely on those jurisdictions taking the specialized business court route.

As of today, post-1993 business courts are located chiefly on the East Coast, from Maine to Florida. There is some form of business court statewide, county specific or in a major city in Maine, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York State, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida. Other business courts are located in Chicago, Reno, Las Vegas, Honolulu and Eugene; and business courts are or have been the subject of serious study and effort in at least Colorado, Michigan, Ohio and Wisconsin.

Are These "New" Courts Simply Imitating Delaware's "Original" Business Court?

The Delaware Court of Chancery is a trial court of equity. During the last 100 years, it has been arguably the Nation's leading trial court on issues of corporate governance; and it remains pre-eminent -- or at least penultimate in pre-eminence to Delaware's Supreme Court – on corporation law. It has, however, no historical jurisdiction over commercial disputes at law solely involving money damages. Rather, multi-million dollar contract or tort actions involving Delaware corporations, litigated in Delaware state court, historically are heard in Delaware's Superior Court, not Chancery.

The distinct commercial and business court models first witnessed in New York City and Chicago are quite different from the Chancery Court model. However, because

the Circuit Court of Cook County retains a separate Chancery Division which also hears business cases, this somewhat limits the jurisdictional scope of the Law Division's "Commercial Calendar." Thus, we'll begin the discussion of new business courts with New York's Commercial Division; a model that includes both law and equity cases, unlike the Court of Chancery (equity only) or Cook County Law Division (law only).

The New York Supreme Court's Commercial Division, which now operates in 10 counties or judicial districts, has a broad jurisdictional model. This is not only because it includes both law and equity cases, but because of the quantity and types of cases it hears. Assuming that a jurisdictional minimum amount in dispute is met, the Commercial Division entertains cases that fall within a specified list of business and commercial case types. There is no express requirement that a case falling within this jurisdictional list must be complex in nature to find its way into the Commercial Division; the case must simply be one among delineated categories of business or commercial disputes. Each case is then assigned to an individual judge from beginning to end.

A different, more selective, model was adopted for the North Carolina Business Court, another of the seminal "new" business courts. As in New York, North Carolina's Business Court is designed to have a single judge hear business and commercial disputes, at equity or law, from beginning to end. However, as originally established in 1995, there were no presumptive case categories defining its jurisdiction; rather, the North Carolina Business Court would only hear business and commercial cases if those cases were *complex*. The Court's protocols set forth criteria as to what made a case complex, along with a judicial gatekeeping mechanism for case selection, which was necessarily more subjective than New York's broad jurisdiction model.

North Carolina's jurisdiction has subsequently been amended to include certain specific categories of cases to be presumptively included on the Business Court's docket, including technology based disputes; but a large swath of unlisted case types must still meet the complexity requirement to find their way into North Carolina's Business Court. By its nature, there will be less cases in such a business court; but those should all be complex cases, providing the Business Court judges with an equally demanding individual case load as those found in broad jurisdiction courts like New York's Commercial Division with a greater variety of case types.

The broad jurisdiction model that defines jurisdiction by case type has been followed in Philadelphia, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Orlando, Miami and Tampa. Chicago's Commercial Calendar uses a similar standard. The complex business dispute model has been adopted in Maryland, Las Vegas, Reno, Atlanta and Pittsburgh. None of the new business courts follow an equity only model as found in the Delaware Court of Chancery.

Most recently, Maine's newly implemented Business and Consumer Docket provides its designated judges with the gatekeeping function as to what cases come within its specialized program; and there will likely be a flexible evolution to shaping that court's jurisdiction. The focus is on claims involving "matters of significance to the transactions, operations or governance of a business entity and/or the rights of a consumer arising out of transactions or other dealings with a business entity," and that "the case requires specialized and differentiated judicial management." Eugene, Oregon's Commercial Court includes a long list of permissible case types (including types going beyond most business court jurisdictional lists), but leaves the decision on whether to

accept a case to the Presiding Judge. In South Carolina's new statewide business court pilot program, jurisdiction exists over 6 specific statutes and "such other cases as the Chief Justice may determine."

The "New" Court of Chancery

A fascinating development among the new business courts is a change in the "old" business court, the Delaware Court of Chancery. In 2003, Maryland implemented its statewide Business and Technology Case Management Program ("BTCMP"). In doing so, it became the first state with a functioning business court to expressly include technology disputes, *e.g.*, computer technology, biotech, *etc.*, in its jurisdiction. While technology disputes are typically business based, and thus arguably within a business court's jurisdiction in any event, Maryland's express use of the term, coupled with extensive plans on judicial education, made a statement that Maryland intended to become especially capable in handling cases that would mark the new 21st century economy.

Within a few months of the BTCMP's implementation, Maryland's neighbor made significant changes in Chancery's historic jurisdiction to reach over into the law-side, *i.e.* to permit the Chancery Court to become a commercial court as well as a business court. Through executive and legislative effort, the Chancery Court's statutory jurisdiction was expanded to include some forms of solely monetary disputes within its original jurisdiction, expressly including technology disputes. This jurisdiction over purely law-side matters was a significant innovation. Additionally, the new statutes provided that Chancery Judges could mediate certain types of commercial disputes, including technology-based disputes; again, even if the disputes involved solely monetary claims. This was the fruition of a "mediation-only" jurisdiction concept, originally conceived in 2001, that would lend the expertise of these business court jurists to commercial litigants in assisting in the resolution of purely monetary disputes; another significant innovation on the historic equity only jurisdiction.

These expansive statutes were not so dramatic, however, as to give Chancery concurrent jurisdiction with Delaware's Superior Court over all business disputes. Further, the new jurisdiction includes a minimum amount in dispute of \$1 Million; and it does not permit for jury trials, unlike the new business courts. It does signal that Delaware is making the extraordinary bench and resources of the Chancery Court available in a wider range of case types, including technology based disputes. Thus, by including some purely commercial actions within its ambit, we might say that Chancery has become part of the new business court trend.

Why Have Specialized Business Courts At All?

There is a perceived need to create a stable and reliably informed system for administering and deciding business and commercial cases. In this respect, business courts are part of a greater movement toward specialization. While there are some estimable opponents of judicial specialization, the theory is that a judge who is consistently hearing a limited – though not small -- universe of case types will develop a greater knowledge and expertise in both the subject matter of these cases and in their procedural management. This will permit these specialist judges to make more reliable and informed decisions, and to do so with greater efficiency.

While many analogies may be offered – "you wouldn't go to a thoracic surgeon for lower back surgery" – the most common point offered in support of judicial

specialization is the fact that lawyers specialize in the areas of the law that they practice. Thus, if it is working for lawyers it will work behind the bench as well.

From another angle, there is also a concern over appearances, *i.e.*, it won't do to have lawyers with decades of experience in an area of the law having their cases decided by judges who have little or no experience with the subtleties of that subject. It theoretically undermines the system when a lawyer on the losing side can tell the client – whether true or not -- that the judge simply did not understand the law; implying that the lawyer is an expert in the field so the judge must be wrong, and therefore a court system that allows judges who don't know the law to decide cases must be unreliable.

There are arguments against judicial specialization, *e.g.*, risks of myopia, lack of cross-pollinating ideas from learning other fields of the law, having the same judge hearing all cases in the same subjects for too long, *etc.* Further, there is the argument that all judges already have a specialization that goes beyond any single subject area and encompasses all subjects, *i.e.*, judging itself.

In light of the number of criminal cases federal judges have on their dockets, and non-business statutory or diversity matters they hear having nothing to do with business disputes, there is yet no great outcry against federal judges hearing business cases. It remains to be seen if the specialized business court judges will start taking cases from federal courts because they pose a lower risk of unpredictable results. If an out-of-state business is sued in one of the business courts, it can remove to federal court. A study on removal, or the lack thereof, in these circumstances would prove useful; as well as a study on out-of-state businesses as business court plaintiffs. There is some anecdotal evidence that contracting parties are including state business courts in choice of venue provisions.

Why Are More Business Courts Being Created?

A core of business courts have survived their initial pilot phases, and developed roots within their court systems. These programs have garnered respect locally, and sometimes regionally or nationally for their expertise, efficacy and internal efficiencies, as well as because of the belief that taking business and commercial cases off of the general docket allows other kinds of cases to move more efficiently as well. Such results have merited, and continue to merit, emulation and consideration by other states.

This is not simply a “you've got one so I better get one” attitude, or a competition over which state can have the best court system *qua* court system. However, competitive implications between cities and states are undeniable. The business court becomes a means to give businesses and their lawyers confidence that business and commercial disputes will be decided with informed and deliberate reasoning. This adds a component of stability to a state, region or city that wants to keep or attract businesses. If a city or state has such a court, and its neighbor does not, that neighboring city or state may come to sense a potential disadvantage. The concentration of business courts along the East Coast may be explained, in some part, by this potential for competitive disadvantage.

Still, not every state court system has adopted a business court when presented with the possibility. In New Jersey, which has had business court pilot programs in Bergen and Essex Counties for over ten years, the Supreme Court rejected legislative efforts to create a commercial division within the state trial court. Oklahoma's Supreme Court has not acted on 2003 legislative authorization to create business courts in Oklahoma City and Tulsa, though it has not rejected that concept either. In Colorado, the

projected case numbers did not justify a business court, and in Milwaukee, an unusually streamlined business case set of procedures was not utilized by the local bar. Michigan's legislative authorization for a "Cyber Court" was quickly passed, but that program was never funded. As stated above, California chose a complex case management model over any form of business court model, as have Connecticut and Arizona; though there are arguments that such programs need not be mutually exclusive. *See* Mitchell L. Bach and Lee Applebaum, *A History of the Creation and Jurisdiction of Business Courts in the Last Decade*, 60 *Bus. Law.* 147, 204-206 (2004). In all of these circumstances, however, the effort to create a business court has evoked considerable thought, attention and even soul searching in some instances.

The Experiment Continues

One consistent argument for business courts is that they may assist the rest of the court system in a number of ways. Business and commercial cases, whether procedurally complex or not, are removed from the general docket which should improve case flow for other areas of litigation.

Further, the business courts may become laboratories for innovations that can be used system-wide. There is clear evidence in New York, where the Commercial Division has been such a "laboratory" in the words of business court pioneer Robert L. Haig, and some of its innovations have been recommended for general use in the New York Supreme Court's Trial Division. A visit to the North Carolina Business Court's website, <http://www.ncbusinesscourt.net/>, shows cutting edge uses of technology on the internet and in the courtroom that could provide general models. And, back to the source, the Court of Chancery's "mediation only" jurisdiction provides a model that other trial courts may consider.

There is also a potential for interesting synergies as individual business courts reach beyond their borders. The American College of Business Court Judges' national membership includes judges from numerous business and complex litigation courts, who meet at least once a year. Opinions are issuing from a number of business courts which are readily available on-line nationally. These are just becoming the subject of legal scholarship, initially with the University of Maryland's *Journal of Business and Technology Law*. More obviously, and most significantly, some business court judges' decisions are having regional or national impact beyond the City or County in which they sit.

In sum, the growth of business courts has been and remains a dynamic process, both within the existing business courts themselves and in relation to other courts and communities.

©Lee Applebaum

A version of this article was originally printed in the March/April 2008 volume of *Business Law Today*, <http://www.abanet.org/buslaw/blt/2008-03-04/applebaum.shtml>