

Justice of the SC Supreme Court on March 22.[The entire 13-page document is reprinted in this issue.]

In the meantime, legislation was being approved in **Nebraska** to authorize state agencies to use the USPS electronic postmark in lieu of the statutorily required certified mail, return receipt requested method. Again, the use of the electronic postmark would be solely at the option of the parties to the communication.

**Maryland** was also becoming a player. The *Uniform Electronic Transactions Act*, which it adopted in 2000, was the subject of legislation introduced by **Delegate Jeanne Haddaway**, to define certain words and terms in the Act. In a hearing held on Feb. 15, two representatives from CT Corporation testified and requested that the following amendment be accepted: (D) This section does not authorize the use of an electronic postmark or electronic postmark certificate for the service of a summons, complaint, or other papers for the purpose of obtaining jurisdiction over a defendant in a lawsuit. Delegate Haddaway called me and stated that this amendment was accepted. She said she thought it was clear in her proposed bill that it didn't apply to service of legal process, but added that she had no objection to the amendment to make that fact abundantly clear.

### What Happens Next?

The onrush of this new challenge has caused a high degree of frustration among some of our members. As is true in most conflicts, not all criticism is bad and some may be very good. The important thing is that everyone be given an opportunity to be heard. It advances no cause and benefits no one when debate turns into a war of words and both sides tune out.

It is critically important, in my opinion, that we not divide our strength in the fight against electronic service of process. We need to band together and speak with one voice. It provides a greater chance of success than if we strike in all directions and dilute our effectiveness. NAPPS didn't get to be the largest, most influential process serving association in the nation by accident. It took a lot of hard work and intelligent leadership. We're smart enough to keep the ball rolling in the right direction.

In the Letters to the Editor section there are letters addressed to the President but sent to the editor for publication. President **MaryLee Rustand** has given permission to publish those letters without editing. She wants everyone to feel free to voice an opinion.

At the upcoming Annual Meeting in Scottsdale, we have set aside ample time in which to have members speak and be heard on the subject of electronic service of process.

### NAPPS Website

Our website continues to be popular with both members and the public. We get very positive feedback from lawyers and others in the legal community. Since 1999 we have had 525,000 visits to the site. While that may average out over the years to about 10,000 per month, the true number of visits currently is running in excess of 17,000 a month.

We have added a new section—**Electronic Service of Process**—to the EDUCATION pull-down menu. We have posted certain documents pertaining to legislation and commentary on this subject. We will continue to publish additional material as it becomes available. All of this is available to the public as well as the members. Contrary to what some may think, NAPPS has never had a members-only section on its website.

Members **John Perez** and **Tony Klein** have set up their own website to publish information on the electronic service of process. You may view their postings at [www.e-serviceofprocess.info](http://www.e-serviceofprocess.info).

You will note that we have modified the **Find a Process Server by Zip Code** section by adding a field to provide the membership date of those members which appear in response to a particular search. This saves the viewer having to leave the site and go to the member's individual listing in order to find out how long he or she has been a member.

### Special Legislation Fund

Our Legislation Fund currently has a balance of \$32,678.00. This is the fund to which members may voluntarily choose to contribute \$25 at the time of paying their annual dues. Payouts for the current year are as follows:

\$3,000.00 to Florida (FAPPS) to reimburse certain legislative expenditures.

**\$8,861.00 to Georgia (GAPPS) to go** toward paying a lobbyist to help in passing new legislation that will give process servers permanent process server status in all Georgia counties.