

Uniform Collaborative Law Act 2010
Proposed Amendments
Submitted by Peter Munson

UCLA Section	Reason for amendment	Comment
Creation of alternative court rules enactment format for the UCLA.	to meet an unanticipated objection	<p>Change in enacting authority only; no substantive change in provisions of the UCLA. See Note to Enactors.</p> <p>All references to “section” in the UCLA are changed to “rule” in the Court Rules version and commentary. Similarly, all references to “act” are changed to “rules” in the Court Rules version. Otherwise, no substantive changes are made.</p> <p>Commentary to some sections in both the Act and Rules version has been modified to include a comment about which enacting process- court rule or legislation- is preferred if states have to choose.</p> <p>Sections 21, 22 and 23 of the UCLA are not included in the Court Rules version. They are standard form sections that seem appropriate only to legislation not court rules. Former section 24 has thus been renumbered Rule 22 in the Court Rules version. The commentary in the UCLA to sections 21, 22 and 23 has been modified to include this notation.</p>
2(5)	to meet an unanticipated objection	Creates an option for enacting states to limit matters submitted to a collaborative law process to those which arise out of a state’s family law or domestic relations code. Substantive change. See proposed new language in the comment to this section for an explanation.
6(a)	to meet an unanticipated objection	Clarifies that a tribunal has the discretion to deny a stay when a collaborative law participation agreement is filed