

**17—13.32 (17A) Informal settlement.**

**13.32(1)** A party to a controversy that may culminate in contested case proceedings may attempt informal settlement of the controversy by complying with the procedures set forth in this subrule. No party to a controversy shall be required to settle the controversy by submitting to informal settlement procedures.

*a.* Parties desiring informal settlement shall set forth in writing the various points of a proposed settlement, which may include a stipulated statement of facts.

*b.* When signed by the parties to a controversy, a proposed settlement shall represent final disposition of the matter in place of contested case proceedings.

*c.* Where there are more than two parties to a controversy before the department, a separate settlement between one party and the department is permissible.

*d.* A proposed settlement which is not accepted or signed by the parties shall not be admitted as evidence in the record of a contested case proceeding.

**13.32(2)** A party to a contested case proceeding may attempt informal settlement by complying with the procedures set forth in this subrule. No party shall be required to settle the contested case proceeding by submitting to informal settlement procedures.

*a.* Parties desiring informal settlement shall set forth in writing the various points of a proposed settlement, which may include a stipulated statement of facts.

*b.* When signed by the parties to the contested case proceeding and the presiding officer, a proposed settlement shall represent final disposition of the proceeding.

*c.* Where there are more than two parties to a contested case proceeding involving the department, a separate settlement between one party and the department is permissible.

*d.* A proposed settlement which is not accepted or signed by the parties and the presiding officer shall not be admitted as evidence in the record of a contested case proceeding. Evidence of conduct or statements made in settlement negotiations likewise are not admissible. This rule does not require exclusion when the evidence is offered for another purpose, such as proving bias or prejudice of a witness, negating a contention of undue delay, or proving an effort to obstruct a criminal investigation or prosecution.