

**Meeting Notes
Oregon Law Commission
OLC MJC 2026-2027 Work Group
Records of Abolished Local Courts
September 15, 2026**

Call to Order

Attendees for this meeting were Kimberly McCullough; Jessica Minifie; Judge Daniel Cross; Judge Emily Oberdorfer, Judge Juliet Britton, Charlie Conrad and Amy Zubko

Records of Abolished Local Courts:

The conversation covered two areas. The first was an overview and discussion of the draft language prepared by Legislative Counsel in response to the meeting held on 8/26/2026. The second was a discussion of the treatment of financial obligations for both open and closed cases upon the closure of a local court.

Discussion of Draft Language

Jessica Minifie opened the discussion with an overview of the draft language. During her overview, Jessica flagged a handful of areas where she had open questions. In addition, OJD, LOC, and the judges provided feedback on the language and potential changes to the language.

Section 1: Under Section 1(2)(b), a question arose as to whether district attorneys and law enforcement should be included in this section.

Section 1(3-4): In Section 1(3-4) OJD suggested that the appropriate phrase to use was “cases and case records” when discussing court records.

Section 1(5): In Section 1(5), LOC suggested that the word “currently” should be removed. Potential language suggested, “currently or upon closure of the court.”

Section 2(5): Tim Dooley (AOC) was unable to attend the meeting however he provided written feedback to the group regarding Section 2(5) which is below in red.

“5) As used in this section, “abolishment” does not include circumstances in which a justice court combines with another justice court or a designated successor justice court within the same county.”

Business Process Discussion

The second half of the meeting focused on the business processes and legal obligations regarding outstanding financial obligations on cases with final judgments. OJD shared options that they had identified to address outstanding financial obligations.

I. Open cases

Upon the closure of a local court, OJD proposed that any open cases that were transferred to the circuit court, the open cases from local courts that were transferred would be treated as state cases going forward. Any judgment entered in the circuit court imposing a financial obligation would be treated the same as it is now under current law. The state would become the obligor and would collect.

II. Closed cases

OJD identified three options for closed cases.

Option 1: Any outstanding financial obligations from closed cases would be collected by OJD and then distributed to cities, counties, and state based on existing processes and according to current revenue distributions required by law for judgments entered in local courts. OJD shared that this would not be possible with the current Odyssey system and would require significant time and potentially an extensive revamp of Odyssey OJD's financial system configurations in addition to manual review of transferred local case records and entry into Odyssey.

Option 2: Any financial obligations from closed cases would be collected by OJD and follow statutory revenue distributions for judgments entered in circuit courts, instead of those for judgments entered in local courts. would be paid to the state. This process would also require records and cases from the local court to be manually uploaded to Odyssey. OJD noted that this would require a list from a local court of the closed cases with unpaid financial obligations and a release of liens. The concern here was that the time and labor costs would be more than the collected debt and that juice might not be worth the squeeze.

Option 3: Any financial obligation from closed cases are deemed satisfied at transfer to the circuit court, and OJD is not required to collect payments for financial obligations imposed by local court judgments when the local court closes and the case record is transferred to the circuit court.

A note on restitution: This would not include restitution which would need additional statutory language. OJD noted that the number of restitution cases are not as high so this would not be as hefty a lift to manually load these into Odyssey. Those cases will need to be identified by the local court before being transferred to the circuit court.

Areas of discussion with closed cases

The conversation focused on whether there would need to be language to allow for a collection recall and the discharge of a number of cases. There was discussion of whether this was similar to changing vendors, and if that is the case, then the local courts could look to their vendor contracts. The discussion also included ORS 153.021(2) and mention of a general order for routine clean-up.

LOC raised an issue with the option to discharge across the board and preferred that cities have the option to discharge and deem satisfied but not put into statute a blanket change in status. They suggested that local courts should have the option to discharge any debt rather than a requirement.