## Fiscal Estimate - 2009 Session

Original Updated	Corrected Supple	mental				
LRB Number <b>09-2016/1</b>	Introduction Number AB-068	0				
Description Temporary restraining orders and injunctions						
Fiscal Effect						
Appropriations  Decrease Existing  Appropriations  Reversible  Appropriations  Create New Appropriations  Local:  No Local Government Costs  Indeterminate  1. Increase Costs  3. Increase	Pease Existing Penues  Pease Existing Penues  Penues  Decrease Costs - May be to absorb within agency within agenc	s budget No				
Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Counties Others  2. Decrease Costs 4. Decrease Revenue School WTCS Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Districts						
Fund Sources Affected  GPR FED PRO PRS	Affected Ch. 20 Appropriation SEG SEGS	ons				
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date				
CTS/ Nancy Rottier (608) 267-9733	Nancy Rottier (608) 267-9733 3/10/2010					

## Fiscal Estimate Narratives CTS 3/10/2010

LRB Number	09-2016/1	Introduction Number	AB-0680	Estimate Type	Original		
Description							
Temporary restraining orders and injunctions							

## **Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate**

This bill makes several changes to the statutes governing temporary restraining orders (TROs) and injunctions. Some of the changes are designed to provide more uniformity between the procedures that govern domestic abuse and harassment TROs and injunctions.

The court system currently maintains forms and procedures for existing TRO and injunction proceedings under ss. 813.12, 813.122, 813,123 and 813.125, Stats. Some of the statutory changes in this bill may require the court system to change existing or adopt new circuit court forms. An accurate estimate of the increased costs associated with these changes is not possible, but it is expected that existing court staff would absorb it.

Section 28 of the bill includes new requirements for the director of state courts and for state courts that may result in increased costs. The proposed s. 813.126(1), Stats. would require the director of state court to prepare and distribute a document explaining the various types of TROs and injunctions. The document is to include the remedies available and the process necessary to obtain a TRO or injunction, and that information is to be specific to each county. Preparation of such a document (or documents that are designed for each county) will require staff time, as well as production costs. No reliable estimate of those costs is available.

Another part of Section 28 would create s. 813.126(2), Stats. that would require courts to "review, rule on, and return" a petition filed under ss. 813.12, 813.122, 813,123 and 813.125, Stats. within a 2-hour period. If that time limit could not be met by the court in the county where it is filed, the statute would require the clerk of circuit court to have another county's court review and rule on the TRO. This provision is likely to require scheduling changes to court calendars, with more adjustments likely in one- or two-judge counties. It also gives additional responsibilities to the clerk of circuit court that presently do not exist. An accurate estimate of the increased costs related to this provision is impossible with existing data.

On March 2, 2010, the author of this bill filed Assembly Substitute Amendment 1. It is important to note that ASA 1 removes the two provisions of the original bill's Section 28 that are described above. Therefore, any increased costs that would have resulted from those provisions would not be incurred under the substitute amendment.

**Long-Range Fiscal Implications**