

**Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Office of Case Management Systems**

CM/ECF

Release Notes

For PACER Users

NextGen CM/ECF Release 1.6.1

February 2021

This page intentionally blank.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	5
2	Filers selecting case participants with last name “Salt”	6
3	PACER court-ordered exemptions defaulting to “not exempt”	7

Update Summary

Date	Section	Change
February 2021	All	Document created.

1 Introduction

This hotfix addresses several functional issues reported by various courts to the National Support Desk over the last several months. This hotfix addresses the following specific issues:

- 1.) External filers selecting case participants with a last name beginning with "Salt" are prevented from filing.
- 2.) PACER users with court-ordered exemptions are incorrectly defaulting to "not exempt" for billing transactions upon accessing a court.

2 Filers selecting case participants with last name "Salt"

Attorneys selecting a case participant with a last name starting with the characters "salt" receive the error "Ciphertext does not begin with a valid header for 'randomiv' header mode" while docketing. Encountering case participant last names such as "Salter" or "Saltman" caused the software to assume certain processes had occurred, when the processes were not actually completed. The incomplete process resulted in the error message being displayed to the filer.

The software has been modified to prevent the error.

3 PACER court-ordered exemptions defaulting to “not exempt”

There were two issues identified with NextGen 1.5 processing of PACER users that have a court ordered exemption for specific courts.

- 1.) The PACER Service Center reported that when a user logs into CMECF via PACER, if that user is configured to be default exempt through a court order in PACER (either for that specific court or for all courts), CMECF is not treating that user as exempt by default. The user has the ability to modify their exemption status using the PACER toggle, however, they may not see the "not exempt" indicator until they have accrued multiple billed transactions, resulting in PACER over-billing.
- 2.) During additional investigation of the court order exemption issue it was determined that a PACER user with a court-specific exemption could take actions that would provide themselves exempt access to all courts, rather than the court ordered exemption for a specific court. This could result in PACER under-billing.

The software has been modified to recognize the exemptions specified by specific courts as identified by the PACER Service Center when the user accesses each court.