In California, as in the U.S. government, the power to govern is divided among three branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. The California court system, the nation’s largest, serves almost 36 million people with more than 2,000 judicial officers and 19,700 court employees working in 451 court locations around the state.

**The Courts**

**California Supreme Court**
- 1 Chief Justice, 6 associate justices
- Hears oral arguments in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Sacramento
- Has discretionary authority to review decisions of the Courts of Appeal and direct responsibility for automatic appeals after death penalty judgments.

**Courts of Appeal**
- 105 justices
- 6 districts, 19 divisions, 9 court locations
- Review the majority of appealable orders and judgments from the superior courts.

**Superior Courts**
- 1,498 judges, 417 commissioners and referees
- 58 courts, one in each county, with from 1 to 55 branches
- Provide a forum for resolution of criminal and civil cases under state and local laws. State and local laws define crimes, specify punishments, and define civil duties and liabilities.

**Branch Agencies**

**Commission on Judicial Appointments**
- Confirms gubernatorial appointments to the Supreme Court and appellate courts.

**Commission on Judicial Performance**
- Constitutionally independent and responsible for the censure, removal, retirement, and private admonishment of judges and commissioners. Decisions subject to appeal by the California Supreme Court.

**Habeas Corpus Resource Center**
- Handles state and federal habeas corpus proceedings in capital cases; provides training and resources for private attorneys who take these cases.

**Mission of the Judicial Council**

Under the leadership of the Chief Justice and in accordance with the California Constitution, the Judicial Council is responsible for ensuring the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice.
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The Judicial Council is the policymaking body of the California courts, the largest court system in the nation. Under the leadership of the Chief Justice and in accordance with the California Constitution, the council is responsible for ensuring the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice. The Administrative Office of the Courts serves as the staff agency for the council.
Foreword

We are pleased to present this short profile of the Judicial Council, the constitutional policymaking body of the California courts, and its staff agency, the Administrative Office of the Courts. It is our mission to ensure the consistent, independent, impartial, and accessible administration of justice for all Californians.

This booklet provides general information about our organization and structure, as well as our history, accomplishments, goals, and current challenges. Also provided is a roster of members who have served on the Judicial Council from 1926 to the present.

We welcome your interest in the judicial branch of state government, and we thank you for the opportunity to serve the interests of justice for the people of California.

Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and Chair of the Judicial Council

William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts
I. The First 80 Years

In 1926 California joined a nationwide court reform movement that encouraged the establishment of judicial councils to bring coherence to court operations and procedures and improve the quality of justice. The public seemed ready for such a change in its 75-year-old court system. The California voters’ pamphlet that year observed that “the work of the various courts is not correlated, and nobody is responsible for seeing that the machinery of the courts is working smoothly.” Advocating for a constitutional amendment to create a policymaking body, the pamphlet noted that, under the present system, “when it is discovered that some rule of procedure is not working well, it is nobody’s business to see that the evil is corrected.” A judicial council, the pamphlet’s authors promised, would ensure that, “whenever anything goes wrong, any judge or lawyer or litigant or other citizen will know to whom to make complaint, and it will be the duty of the council to propose a remedy, and if this cannot be done without an amendment to the laws, the council will recommend to the Legislature any change in the law which it deems necessary.”

In November, voters overwhelmingly agreed. By a vote of more than two to one, Californians approved the amendment creating the Judicial Council as the governing body of the state’s third branch, putting into its hands the responsibility for overseeing the administration of justice throughout the state’s multitiered and far-flung court system. Since then, the Judicial Council has remained a vital leader of state judicial administration.
Early Achievements. Although it lacked both facilities and staff, the Judicial Council began California’s first survey of superior courts within a month of its inaugural meeting, under the leadership of its first chair, Chief Justice William H. Waste. When the survey revealed that the condition of court business was “dismal,” the council recommended close to 50 legislative bills aimed at correcting some of the “evils” that had been identified.

The constitutional amendment creating the Judicial Council authorized the Chief Justice to assign judges from less encumbered courts to those carrying the heaviest caseloads, to “equalize the work of all judges.” This practice provided only a temporary solution to a growing problem, however. Three reforms during this period helped ease court workload pressures: the establishment of the Fourth Appellate District of the Court of Appeal, the creation of new trial court judgeships, and the expansion of the jurisdictions of some lower courts. Encouraged by these early milestones, courts and the Legislature worked together over the following decades to adopt a continuing series of reforms.

From the eve of World War II to 1962, California became the most populous state in the nation, with its number of residents swelling from 9 million to 22 million. Presiding over the court system during this time of rapid change was Supreme Court Justice Phil S. Gibson, who became the Judicial Council’s second chair in June 1940. For the next 25 years, this respected jurist established the council as an initiator of solutions and led an overhaul and modernization of the state’s court system.

Under the Gibson administration, the council recommended constitutional amendments and statutes that led to, among other things, the creation of the Commission on Judicial Qualifications (later renamed the Commission on Judicial Performance), an organization responsible for the censure, removal, retirement, and private admonishment of judges and commissioners; the estab-
lishment of the Fifth Appellate District, based in Fresno; uniform procedures for juvenile courts; adoption of standard procedures for appeal in justice court and small claims cases; and authorization to use retired judges, through the Assigned Judges Program, to assist courts with heavy caseloads.

**Turning Points.** Two initiatives dominated the landscape in the postwar era. The first occurred in 1950, a year after a Judicial Council study revealed the existence of 767 courts of six different types below the superior court level. The council consolidated the six types into only two—municipal courts and justice courts—with uniform judicial qualifications, salaries, and provisions for financial support. This move not only improved public service and the quality of justice, but it also laid the foundation for further reorganization measures during the following decades, which culminated almost half a century later in the complete unification of 220 municipal and superior courts into 58 superior courts, one in each county.

Chief Justice Gibson also is credited with a second initiative—the creation of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Until that time, the Judicial Council had functioned without a dedicated staff. Its work was performed by council members aided by staff of the Supreme Court. A 1960 amendment to article VI of the California Constitution created the position of Administrative Director of the Courts, and the following year the Legislature granted resources for the establishment of the AOC. The council appointed the nationally respected Ralph N. Kleps as the AOC’s first director (see profile on page 37).

The establishment of the AOC was a turning point in Judicial Council history. At last the council had the dedicated resources with which to continuously pursue improvements in court administration.

Soon after its creation, the AOC began to assume an operational role, acquiring new responsibilities that promoted greater flexibility and efficiency in the judicial system. In 1965 the state’s Department of Finance transferred to the AOC all fiscal support services for the Judicial Council, the appellate
courts, and other state judicial agencies. Five years later, legislation gave the Judicial Council the authority to allocate state funds for its own support and that of the appellate courts. The council delegated that authority to the Administrative Director of the Courts, who acted with the approval of the Chief Justice. That same year, the chair of the council was given salary-setting authority for employees of the state-level courts and judicial agencies. In response to these new duties, the AOC established staffs to handle personnel, fiscal, accounting, and data processing duties. The agency’s role continued to expand. By the end of the century it encompassed a broad range of services to some 20,000 judicial branch staff members of 75 trial and appellate courts in 451 court locations.

During the 22-year period from 1964 to 1986, the Judicial Council and the AOC oversaw a renaissance in judicial administration under the leadership of Chief Justices Roger J. Traynor (1964–1970), Donald R. Wright (1970–1977), and Rose Elizabeth Bird (1977–1986). Indeed, many of the most sweeping court reforms in state history took root in this era. Rules of court practice and procedure were refined. The council defined the use of cameras in the courtroom, developed a system for identifying judgeship needs, reformed the appellate court system, and assumed a major role in family law when California, with the Family Law Act, became the first state to endorse no-fault divorce.

By developing and adopting these new programs and by enhancing established practices, the judiciary was able to adapt to the state’s unique social and economic changes, which included unprecedented population growth and diversity. It was during this era that the council began to grapple with policy decisions that went beyond procedure and rules. Particularly by the 1980s, its focus had turned to issues of governance, the role of the judiciary, and strategic planning.
Structural Transformation. The trial court reorganization of 1950, while increasing administrative efficiency and economy, did not completely alleviate caseload problems. In the early 1970s, the Judicial Council continued to explore the feasibility of a completely unified trial court system. Eventually it merged the municipal and justice courts into a single municipal court. The goal of unification with the superior courts remained a top priority for the next two decades.

1985 Trial Court Funding Act. In her 1983 State of the Judiciary address, Chief Justice Bird outlined principles for state funding of the California trial courts. Those principles were incorporated into the 1985 Trial Court Funding Act, under which the trial courts were to be recognized as part of a single state court system and funded by the state. Up to that time, the trial courts—unlike the appellate courts, which historically were state funded—had depended heavily on county revenues. This dependency had caused widespread uncertainties and disparities among the courts and made long-range planning impossible. The 1985 law was heralded even though no actual funds were appropriated to implement it. Undeterred, the council and the AOC continued to work toward the goal of full trial court funding throughout the next decade. Success was at last achieved in 1997 (see page 11).

Education. One of the most significant developments in the 1970s was the establishment of the California Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER) by the California Judges Association and the Judicial Council. It was the most extensive program of its kind in the United States at that time and remains a world leader in judicial education today. In 1994 CJER merged with the AOC’s Administrative Education Unit and is now part of the agency’s Education Division. It provides ongoing training and education for judges and court employees.
The administration that began in 1987, when Chief Justice Malcolm M. Lucas took the helm, opened an epoch marked by quantitative and qualitative reforms. Realizing that the judiciary must speak with a unified voice to be effective as an independent branch of government, the council and the AOC made a deep assessment of California’s court system. Great strides were made in reducing trial court delays as well as in the council’s historic goals of trial court unification and state funding. Far-reaching court technology changes were set in motion. Protecting judicial independence was at the center of this mission, as was the goal of optimizing local trial court control. In particular, the Lucas administration was marked by the advent of long-range strategic planning. Finally, landmark studies on fairness in the courts elevated the improvement of court access to the status of a guiding principle for the council.

**Trial Court Improvement.** In 1987 a fundamental shift in California’s case management policy began with the implementation of the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act, designed to reduce case-processing time. The 1988 Brown-Presley Trial Court Funding Act signaled that California had finally accepted partial funding responsibility for its trial courts. Three years later, the Trial Court Realignment and Efficiency Act increased state funding in exchange for reforms, among them the adoption of trial court coordination. In 1992, while the counties remained the primary source of trial court funding, the council created a special commission to oversee trial court budget submissions to the Legislature and allocate state funds, a function that clearly established the judiciary as an equal branch of government. The council also outlined standards that trial courts would use “for purposes of internal evaluation, self-assessment, and self-improvement.”

**Planning for the Future.** The year 1992 was the dawn of long-range strategic planning. That year the Judicial Council adopted its first Strategic and Reorganization Plan, which set forth five explicit goals. In so doing, the judicial branch was offering assurance that present and future resources would be dedicated to public service improvements.

The year before, the council had brought together a diverse group of representatives of the public, the judiciary, the Legislature, academia, law enforce-
ment agencies, and court administrators to form the Commission on the Future of the California Courts. In a little over two years, this commission carried out the most comprehensive review of the California judiciary in history, offering more than 200 recommendations for reinventing a justice system that would become more accessible and more efficient for a changing California.

In the following years, the council and the AOC began to implement many of these recommendations. Alternative dispute resolution (ADR) forums emerged; specialty courts for families, drug-related cases, domestic violence, and other case types were established; training for judges and court staffs was enhanced; the number and quality of court interpreters gained significance; and the need to reform the state’s jury system was recognized.

**Access and Fairness.** Asserting that all Californians should have speedy and ready access to their court system, the Judicial Council during this period made “access and fairness” a permanent guiding principle. In 1987 Chief Justice Lucas, continuing work begun by Chief Justice Bird, created the Advisory Committee on Gender Bias in the Courts. That committee submitted 68 recommendations for reform, which were adopted by the council. This advance was followed in 1991 by the formation of a special committee on racial and ethnic bias in the courts. To institutionalize the values of equal access and fairness, the Judicial Council formed the Advisory Committee on Racial and Ethnic Bias in the Courts in 1991 and the Access and Fairness Advisory Committee three years later. The latter was charged with making recommendations for continual improvements in access and fairness in the courts in relation to race, ethnicity, gender, persons with disabilities, and sexual orientation.

On May 1, 1996, Supreme Court Associate Justice Ronald M. George was sworn in as the 27th Chief Justice of California. Under his leadership, California courts continue to initiate statewide reforms on an unprecedented scale.
Restructuring. Chief Justice George renewed the council’s vigorous advocacy for trial court funding and unification. He, with the assistance of the AOC and the Administrative Director of the Courts, William C. Vickrey, led the courts through dire crises and ultimately to resounding successes with the passage of the Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 and, a year later, Proposition 220, which provided for voluntary unification of the superior and municipal courts in each county. By 2001, the courts in all 58 counties had voted to unify into single countywide trial court systems. As a result of these two landmark developments, California trial courts, for the first time in their history, could proceed as an integrated branch. These remarkable achievements, along with two later interrelated reforms—the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act and the Trial Court Facilities Act—strengthened the judicial branch’s ability to manage its resources prudently and in the best interests of the public.

Forging Partnerships. Within one year of assuming office, Chief Justice George visited each of California’s 58 counties to meet with local court leaders. His ambitious statewide outreach programs have promoted unity and cooperation between the Judicial Council, the AOC, and the courts and between the executive and legislative branches. As a result, the judiciary entered the new millennium a strong, independent, and co-equal branch that, the Chief Justice says, “stands ready to resolve cases for all who need our assistance, . . . reaches its decisions without hint of prejudice or passion, and . . . accepts responsibility for the management of its own affairs.”

Progress Continues. The current era is focused on productivity, accountability, and innovation. The council has developed a variety of programs to improve public access and fairness and to expedite court processes, services, and support. Key to the modern era is the council’s keen focus on unity and cooperation within the judicial branch and between it and its sister branches. By incorporating input from all interested entities and individuals, the council has created a judicial branch that encourages dialogue and innovation, thereby enabling courts to more effectively meet modern needs.
Challenges. Today the Judicial Council sets policy for one of the largest and most diverse court systems in the world—a system in which challenges arising from social and economic pressures, increased expectations, and the fast pace of change require innovative responses. More than ever before, the Judicial Council and the AOC must work collaboratively with community, social service, and justice system partners. Chief Justice George and Administrative Director Vickrey are committed to such broad collaboration. Under their leadership, the Judicial Council and the AOC strive to advocate effectively on behalf of the entire branch and make difficult decisions to ensure that courts throughout the state are fair and accessible. The underlying goal is to improve public trust and confidence not only in California’s justice system but also in our state government as a whole. Steps are under way to amend the California Constitution to strengthen and solidify the judicial branch as a separate, equal branch of government.

Court Reformer

Chief Justice Ronald M. George is fond of saying, “Court reform is not for the short-winded.” A committed runner, George has persevered since he became Chief Justice on May 1, 1996, securing stable funding for the trial courts, presiding over the successful merger of the municipal and superior courts, and pushing for jury duty reforms to make jury service less burdensome and more understandable to the citizenry.

Since George became Chief Justice, the state judicial branch has taken over responsibility for managing courthouses from the counties, more trial court and appellate judges have been added, and there is additional funding for court technology, court interpreters, and court-based programs for families and children.

Pragmatic, “affable, and seemingly inexhaustible,” as veteran legal affairs writer Bob Egelko put it in California Courts Review, George may be “in the same league as renowned Chief Justice Phil S. Gibson,” California’s first great judicial branch administrator. In its review of his 10-year legacy, The Recorder newspaper concluded, “If he resigned today, . . . the native Los Angeleno would go down in history as an astute administrator who reshaped the state’s judicial system and its facilities, and as a savvy politician who, through his rulings and persuasive personality, muscled up the judiciary as a legitimate and independent third branch of government.”

George’s accomplishments have not gone unnoticed nationally. He is the recipient of the National Center for State Courts’ 2002 William H. Rehnquist Award for Judicial Excellence and is past president of the Conference of Chief Justices, which represents the top judicial officers of the nation’s states and territories.
II. The New Era: Structural Reforms

The judicial branch entered the 21st century strengthened by two long-sought reforms: state funding of the trial courts and trial court unification. Later, the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act and the Trial Court Facilities Act completed the transformation of the trial courts into a fully integrated state-operated court system for California. These structural changes have produced more extensive and more rapid public service advances than have been seen at any other time in state history.

Key legislation during the 1980s succeeded in increasing the state’s share of responsibility for trial court funding under a system in which trial courts were subjected to two separate budget processes at the county and state levels. The landmark Lockyer-Isenberg Trial Court Funding Act of 1997 eliminated the bifurcated system. The act gave the state full responsibility for trial court funding and charged the Judicial Council with overseeing the process and developing a budget structure that assesses court performance. The court budget process is tied both to the priorities outlined in the council’s strategic plan and to local court strategic plans. Overall, trial court funding accomplishes four historic goals of the judicial branch by:

- Providing a stronger, more focused statewide system for trial courts;
- Allowing policy and planning to drive the budget process and thus improve fiscal responsibility and accountability;
Enhancing equal access to justice by removing disparities caused by the varying abilities of individual counties to address the operating needs of the courts and to provide basic and constitutionally mandated services; and

Providing for automatic annual budget increases to cover changes in the cost of conducting court business without having to justify yearly cost hikes.

The second fundamental structural change for the judicial branch was the voluntary unification of the superior and municipal courts into a single level of trial court, made possible by Proposition 220, otherwise known as Senate Constitutional Amendment 4, which voters overwhelmingly approved in 1998. That amendment abolished the municipal level of courts and merged the municipal courts’ officers, employees, facilities, records, and pending matters with those of the unified superior court unless otherwise provided by statute.

The Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act, which took effect January 1, 2001, transferred responsibility for employees from counties to the courts. The AOC is providing statewide guidance in policy development and administration to these 58 independent personnel systems that once relied on their counties for personnel services.

The Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002 completes the transformation from the old system of 58 independently operating county trial court bodies to a system fully operated and managed by the state. Co-sponsored by the Judicial Council and the California State Association of Counties, the act shifted governance of California’s more than 450 courthouse facilities from the counties to the state. This legislation, which took effect January 1, 2003, furthers the goal of ensuring that all Californians receive equal access to safe, secure, and adequate court facilities. Thus far, at least a half-dozen court facilities have transferred from county to state ownership.
Trial court funding and unification were the crown jewels of the Judicial Council’s long reform, but in recent years the court system has brought about many other innovative reforms related to the council’s strategic goals. Some of the highlights follow.

**Access, Fairness, and Diversity.** Improving access for all Californians, including those who are economically disadvantaged, is a major goal of the Judicial Council. At the urging of Chief Justice George and the State Bar, the state has allocated funding for legal services to the poor. The council also has created a bilingual online self-help center for litigants who go to court without attorneys and established a vigorous program to increase the number of court interpreters. The program has included pay raises to attract and maintain the services of these critically important professionals. Also, new legislation in 2002 established the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, which enabled approximately 1,300 independent court interpreters to become court employees with full benefits and the right to bargain collectively. In 2003, more than 600 court interpreters changed status from independent contractors to pro tempore employees.

Additional activities include the creation of specialty courts to improve court access in cases involving youth, domestic violence, the mentally ill, veterans, and the homeless. The council and AOC are leading programs to improve access for non-English speakers and expand educational programs for judges and court staffs on diversity and cultural competence, gender fairness, sexual orientation fairness, and barriers to access and fairness for persons with disabilities. The council’s Access and Fairness Advisory Committee is developing a second demographic survey of the court system, evaluating the status of the courts’ local fairness committees, and has published a benchguide on Native American legal issues.

**Independence and Accountability.** To serve the overall interests of the judicial branch, the Judicial Council has refined strategic planning, linking its own plan to the local courts’ individual community-focused strategic plans. A task force is overseeing efforts to institutionalize community outreach programs in the courts. The council and the AOC aligned the trial
court budget process more closely with those of the other branches and created a modern, standardized system of court fiscal administration for the prudent management of the judicial branch’s financial resources. They also developed an objective process for determining the numbers of judicial officers needed in the trial courts. Concern for preserving the high quality of the California judiciary led the Chief Justice to create a task force (now an advisory committee) to study judicial service, retention, and compensation.

The Judicial Council continues to adopt uniform rules of court, preempting local rules, in more areas of practice. Practitioners who traverse county lines on behalf of clients thus can be assured that the practices followed in each county will be the same. In addition, the council approved the first major reorganization and revision of the California Rules of Court, which will improve their clarity and usefulness.

In one of the most significant steps, the Judicial Council enlisted the support of judges and lawyers to seek amendments to the state Constitution that would promote access to justice and ensure the independence of the judicial branch while enhancing accountability within the branch for the fair and effective administration of justice.

**Modernization of Management and Administration.**
Among numerous important projects to promote public confidence in the integrity and fairness of the arbitration process, the Judicial Council has adopted ethics standards for neutral arbitrators in private contractual arbitration. The council also set up a Complex Civil Litigation Pilot Program in six courts to test methods of increasing case-processing speed and efficiency. Other trial courts are testing pilot programs to assess the benefits of early mediation in civil cases. By creating uniform rules in several key areas, the council has effected statewide uniformity in court procedures. In the appellate area, it approved the first major revision in California’s appellate court rules in more than a century.

**Quality of Justice.** The AOC’s Center for Families, Children & the Courts has gained national recognition for its innovative programs for handling the problems of special constituencies. It was formed in two stages between 1994 and 1997 by Administrative Director Vickrey to meet the needs of children, families, and self-represented litigants in the courts.
The quality of justice also has been improved by recent efforts to make jury service less burdensome. The council raised jurors’ pay from $5 to $15 a day and is advocating for additional raises. Another key achievement was the one-day or one-trial jury selection system, which dramatically reduced the time that potential jurors had to wait for assignments or to be excused from further duty. In 2003, the council released new simplified jury instructions for civil cases; in 2005 simplified criminal jury instructions were adopted.

**Education.** The AOC’s Education Division is expanding professional development opportunities for California’s judges and court employees by using distance education technologies, including satellite broadcasts. In addition, new curricula are being developed to enhance the knowledge of judicial officers and court staffs in areas of major current interest.

**Technology.** Automation is making courts more efficient and accessible. The council has adopted the branch’s first statewide technology coordination plan, and the AOC is developing a telecommunications infrastructure to connect the justice community. A new system for automated statistical reporting and warehousing of caseload data was developed. Moreover, courts are using the Internet to provide unprecedented public access to court information.

In 2002, the council approved statewide rules that expand public access to electronic trial court records. It also adopted statewide rules on e-filing that allow the payment of filing fees online with credit cards and authorize the serving of notice by electronic means. Other projects are aimed specifically at easing the burdens of complex litigation. Appellate courts now provide online access to information about their cases and can furnish automatic notification to counsel and the parties concerning significant events in a particular case.

Improving public access and fairness through technological advances, court services and procedures, and judicial and administrative education remains an ongoing challenge in a society where social and economic changes continue to make new demands on the courts. Currently, the council is implementing the Trial Court Facilities Act, which gave the state full responsibility for more than 450 court facilities in
California, a significant number of which need repair, renovation, or maintenance. The council also is eager to develop integrated court technology systems that will allow coordination among courts, law enforcement agencies, and other parts of the justice system.

**The Expanding Role of the AOC.** When the Administrative Office of the Courts was created in 1960, its primary duty was to provide staff support to the Judicial Council in carrying out its constitutional responsibilities. Over the last four decades that role has grown dramatically. In particular, the 1990s saw quantum leaps in the administration of justice, which greatly expanded the AOC’s responsibilities.

Today the agency’s role is one of leadership, knowledge, and service to the judicial branch and the public. Its duties encompass statewide fiscal policy and planning, legal services, technology development, human resources management, judicial education, improved court services for families and children, statewide research and planning, and an array of other programs to improve a variety of court administration areas. Toward these efforts, the AOC has established three regional offices as part of its strategic plan to provide support services and improve access and responsiveness at the local level. The regional administrative directors are dedicated to building partnerships and to facilitating communication between the AOC and the courts. Each regional office serves as liaison, clearinghouse, advocate, consultant, and service provider to the appellate and trial courts. The AOC also works with some 30 Judicial Council advisory committees and task forces comprising more than 600 representatives from the courts and the bar. Together they help the council shape policies and create programs to meet the challenges of California courts and the needs of the public in the 21st century.
III. Council Organization and Structure

The authorization for the Judicial Council is contained in article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution, which also specifies the council’s membership (along with terms of office) and functions. Amendments to that section between 1960 and 1966 broadened the membership and authorized the establishment of the AOC. Rules 6.1–6.70 of the California Rules of Court contain the council’s mission statement, guiding principles, and nominating procedures and describe the function and duties of each of the council’s committees.

The 28 members of the council include the following:

❖ The Chief Justice of California, who serves as the council’s chair;
❖ 14 judges appointed by the Chief Justice;
❖ 4 attorney members appointed by the State Bar Board of Governors;
❖ 1 member from each house of the California Legislature;
❖ 7 advisory members, including court executives; and
❖ The Administrative Director of the Courts, who serves as secretary.

Members of the council are selected through a nominating procedure designed to attract applicants from throughout the legal system, with diverse backgrounds, experiences, and geographic locations. The council’s Executive and Planning Committee publicizes the vacancies and solicits nominations and applications. For each position, except
for a Supreme Court position, it selects nominees from the names submitted and makes recommendations on appointments to the Chief Justice. The committee gives added consideration to persons who have served on Judicial Council advisory committees or task forces. The Chief Justice makes appointments to the council by order.

Terms are staggered, with one-third of the council’s membership changing each year. This ensures continuity while creating opportunities for new participation and input. The council members serve without compensation except for reimbursement of travel and lodging expenditures.

The Judicial Council has constitutional responsibility to survey judicial business; study the operation of the courts; adopt rules not inconsistent with statute in the areas of court administration, practice, and procedure; and make recommendations to the courts, the Governor, and the Legislature.

The council also has responsibility for:

- Establishing direction and setting priorities for the continual improvement of the court system;
- Sponsoring and taking positions on legislation that affects the California judicial system;
- Approving budgets for the California judicial branch; and
- Responding to appropriate mandates from the Legislature.

The Judicial Council’s vision for the California court system is defined in its strategic plan, *Leading Justice Into the Future*. The plan outlines six goals and detailed action plans for the council’s committees and the AOC. The Judicial Council’s six goals are to improve:
1. Access, fairness, and diversity;
2. Independence and accountability;
3. Modernization of management and administration;
4. Quality of justice and service to the public;
5. Education; and
6. Technology.

The plan was developed with input from judges and court administrators from across the state as well as representatives of the State Bar, the Legislature, the executive branch, and the public. At the state level, the Judicial Council is responsible for adopting policies, court rules, standards of judicial administration, and budget and management regulations; proposing legislation; and conducting studies. At the local level, courts are asked to develop plans that support the statewide goals and respond to the special needs of their communities.

In 1992 the Judicial Council reorganized its operating procedures and committees to increase participation in its activities and better fulfill its role as a deliberative policymaking body and a cohesive, effective voice with other branches of government. The council holds six to eight two-day meetings a year. A majority of its members must be present at each business meeting for the council to take action. Between meetings, the council may use circulating orders to take action on items requiring immediate consideration. Most agenda items are examined by advisory committees before they appear on the agenda. Recommendations regarding rules of court are circulated broadly for comment.

The council’s Executive and Planning Committee coordinates the annual schedule and establishes agendas for council meetings. The AOC posts meeting notices and agendas on the California Courts Web site at www.courtinfo.ca.gov. All items on the council’s agenda are classified as consent, discussion, or informational items. Consent items are noncontroversial items that require council action and do not require presentation or discussion. They are handled as a group in the business meeting and are approved by the council without discussion.
A consent item can be moved to the discussion agenda in response to a request from a council member. Discussion items may or may not require council action. They do require time on the agenda for presentation and discussion. Items are placed on the discussion agenda if they are noteworthy, complex, or controversial. Informational items do not require presentation, discussion time, or council action and are presented solely in written form at the meeting.

**Rule Making.** The Judicial Council is authorized by the California Constitution to adopt rules for court administration, practice, and procedure that are not inconsistent with statute. (Cal. Const., art. VI, § 6.) Rules, forms, and standards of judicial administration are circulated for comment twice a year, for adoption effective January 1 and July 1. Following is a brief summary of this process. (For more information, see Cal. Rules of Court, rules 6.20–6.22.)

- Any person or organization may submit a request for a new or amended rule of court, form, or standard of judicial administration.
- An advisory committee analyzes the proposal and makes a recommendation to the council’s Rules and Projects Committee, which reviews the committee’s recommendation and, if it deems it appropriate, circulates the proposal for public comment.
- The advisory committee receives the comments and considers them. Then it decides whether to recommend adoption of the original proposal or a modified version or recommend some other course of action. If the committee recommends adoption, the matter is placed on the council’s agenda.
- The Rules and Projects Committee reviews the advisory committee’s recommendation and submits its own recommendation to the council.
- The council may adopt, modify, or reject the proposed rule, form, or standard.
Open Meeting Policy. The council’s business meetings are open to the public. Discussions of litigation, personnel matters, contract or legislative negotiations, the purchase or sale of real estate, security plans or procedures, and allegations of criminal or professional misconduct ordinarily take place in closed session.

Members of the public who wish to speak at a business meeting must submit a request of no more than two pages to the chair of the Executive and Planning Committee by delivering it to the AOC at least four business days before the meeting. The contents of such a request are outlined in rule 6.6(d) of the California Rules of Court. The Executive and Planning Committee must respond to the request at least two business days before the meeting.

Public access to meetings at which trial court budgets are discussed is described in rule 6.702 of the California Rules of Court. Meetings are audio-cast and archived for increased public access to the business of the council.

Cameras. Business meetings may be photographed, recorded, or broadcast at the discretion of the Chief Justice. A request to do so must be received by the Chief Justice at least two business days before the meeting.

Judicial Council Outreach. Council members regularly conduct two or three site visits a year, reaching about six local courts, to report on council actions, hear from local judges and administrators, and then report to the council on the visits.

In addition to these outreach efforts, the Judicial Council maintains vigorous communications with courts, the other branches of state government, and agencies and organizations that work with the courts, such as the Department of Justice, Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Department of Motor Vehicles, Department of Social Services, California District Attorneys Association, Office of the State Public Defender, California Department of Child Support Services, and State Bar of California.
Under the Judicial Council’s own governance principles, each of its members is appointed by the Chief Justice to serve on one or more internal committees. These committees consider matters and then report to the council.

**Executive and Planning Committee.**
Reviews the materials and sets the agendas for Judicial Council meetings. Oversees the council’s operating procedures and the implementation of its strategic plan—including how the judicial branch budget relates to the plan—and serves as the nominating committee for vacancies on the council and advisory committees. The committee also oversees advisory committees and task forces as assigned by the Chief Justice.

**Policy Coordination and Liaison Committee.**
Represents the council in discussions with other government branches and agencies and makes recommendations on relevant issues and legislation.

**Rules and Projects Committee.** Oversees the development of the California Rules of Court, the Standards of Judicial Administration, and Judicial Council forms. The committee also oversees advisory committees and task forces as assigned by the Chief Justice.

**Litigation Management Committee.** Oversees litigation and claims that seek recovery of $50,000 or more or raise important policy issues and are initiated against trial court judges, the Judicial Council, the AOC, the trial and appellate courts, or the employees of those bodies.

**Interim Court Facilities panel.** Assists the council, on an interim basis, in fulfilling its responsibilities for court facilities, as specified by the Trial Court Facilities Act of 2002. As of July 1, 2007, these responsibilities will be exercised by the council’s Executive and Planning Committee.

Judicial Council advisory committees and task forces are established to monitor certain topics or areas of the law and to make recommendations to the council. The Chief Justice may appoint advisory committees and task forces to advise the council on the con-
dition of business in the courts, how to improve the administration of justice, or how to perform any of its other duties.

The council’s nomination process encourages diversity in appointments and ensures the participation of judges, court officials, the general public, representatives of public agencies, and attorneys from throughout the state. Committee members’ differing perspectives, expertise, and experiences produce informed and comprehensive advice for the council’s consideration. The current advisory committees follow.

**Access and Fairness Advisory Committee.** Monitors issues related to access to the judicial system and fairness in the state courts and provides policy direction in these areas. The committee is organized into five subcommittees that address racial and ethnic fairness, sexual orientation fairness, gender fairness, and access for persons with disabilities, as well as education and implementation.

**Administrative Presiding Justices Advisory Committee.** Improves appellate court justices’ participation in the Judicial Council’s decision-making process; reviews rules, forms, studies, and recommendations related to appellate court administration that are proposed to the Judicial Council; identifies issues of concern to the courts, including legislative issues, that might be addressed by the council or one of its advisory committees or task forces; and increases communication between the council and the appellate courts.

**Advisory Committee on Civil Jury Instructions.** Provides jury instructions in clear, understandable language so they are more useful to jurors. The Judicial Council in 2003 approved approximately 800 new civil jury instructions and special verdict forms.

**Advisory Committee on Criminal Jury Instructions.** Regularly reviews case law and statutes affecting jury instructions and makes recommendations to the council for updating, amending, and adding topics to the council’s criminal jury instructions. The Judicial Council in 2005 approved new criminal jury instructions to replace those in use for approximately 70 years.
Appellate Advisory Committee. Advises the Judicial Council on matters related to appellate procedure, forms, standards, practices, and operations and identifies issues of concern to the appellate courts (including legislative issues) that might be taken up by the council.

Civil and Small Claims Advisory Committee. Identifies issues and concerns confronting the judiciary in the areas of civil procedure, practice, and case management (including small claims and alternative dispute resolution) and suggests appropriate solutions and responses.

Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. Makes recommendations to the council for developing collaborative justice courts; for improving the processing of cases in drug courts, domestic violence courts, youth courts, and other treatment courts; and for overseeing the evaluation of drug courts throughout the state.

Court Executives Advisory Committee. Improves court administrators’ access to and participation in the Judicial Council’s decision-making process; reviews rules, forms, standards, studies, and recommendations related to court administration that are proposed to the council by advisory committees or task forces; identifies issues of concern to the courts, including legislative issues, that might be taken up by the Judicial Council or one of its advisory committees or task forces; and increases communication between the council and the trial courts.

Court Interpreters Advisory Panel. Works to improve the number and quality of interpreters in the courts and proposes comprehensive legislation and training for interpreters.

Court Technology Advisory Committee. Promotes, coordinates, and facilitates the application of technology to the work of the courts. The committee is charged with recommending standards to ensure technological compatibility; facilitating court technology projects funded in whole or in part by the state; proposing rules, standards, or legislation to ensure privacy, access, and security; and assisting courts in acquiring and developing useful technology systems.

Criminal Law Advisory Committee. Identifies issues and concerns confronting the judiciary in the areas of criminal procedure,
practice, and case management and suggests solutions and responses.

**Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.** Identifies issues and concerns confronting the judiciary in the areas of procedure, practice, and management for cases involving families, children, and self-represented litigants and suggests solutions and responses.

**Governing Committee of the Center for Judicial Education and Research (CJER).** Makes recommendations to the Judicial Council for improving the administration of justice through education and training for judicial officers and other judicial branch personnel.

**Judicial Service Advisory Committee.** Assesses and recommends legislation and pilot projects related to judicial service, retention, and compensation and proposes new rules and changes to existing rules, standards, and forms. Identifies and evaluates current and best practices, both national and local, and develops or recommends necessary training.

**Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee.** Makes recommendations to the council for improving the administration of justice in proceedings involving (1) decedents’ estates, trusts, conservatorships, guardianships, and other probate matters and (2) people with mental health or developmental disabilities.

**Traffic Advisory Committee.** Works to improve the administration of justice in the area of traffic and bail-forfeitable offense adjudication; identifies policy issues and recommends rules and/or model procedures that will result in more consistent handling of traffic and bail-forfeitable offenses across the state; and provides analysis in support of policy decisions made by the Judicial Council and the Legislature regarding traffic and bail-forfeitable offense matters.

For more information about committees and task forces, including membership rosters, visit [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/jc/advisorycommittees.htm](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/jc/advisorycommittees.htm).
Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee.
Improves trial court judges’ access to and participation in the Judicial Council’s decision-making process; reviews rules, forms, studies, and recommendations related to court administration that are proposed to the council; identifies issues of concern to the courts, including legislative issues, that might be addressed by the council or one of its advisory committees or task forces; and enhances council-court communications.

Proposals and major issues that do not fall within the purview of advisory committees may be referred to a task force. Task forces may be established by the chair of the Judicial Council, the Administrative Director of the Courts, or the council itself. They report to an advisory committee or an internal council committee, which in turn makes a recommendation to the full council. Current task forces include:

❖ Appellate Indigent Defense Oversight Advisory Committee
❖ Court Facilities Transitional Task Force
❖ Domestic Violence Practice and Procedure Task Force
❖ Legal Services Trust Fund Commission
❖ Probate Conservatorship Task Force
❖ Science and the Law Steering Committee
❖ Task Force on Judicial Ethics Issues
❖ Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants
A 1960 constitutional amendment sponsored by the State Bar and the Judicial Council created the office of the Administrative Director of the Courts. A year later, the Administrative Office of the Courts was established when the council adopted a resolution that is now embodied in rule 6.81 of the California Rules of Court (see “The Expanding Role of the AOC,” page 16).

The AOC, the Judicial Council’s staff agency, carries out the official actions of the council under the supervision of the Administrative Director of the Courts. The AOC is structured to provide (1) professional services to the courts and the council, including programs for implementing trial court funding and unification, and legal services, including litigation management; (2) an array of programs to improve justice administration, such as court services for children and families and the complex litigation program; and (3) programs to enhance court technology, judicial branch education, and human resources support.

In addition, three regional offices, based in the northern, coastal, and southern parts of the state, work to improve, facilitate, and increase communication among the trial and appellate courts through a primary focus on operations and by gaining consensus on policy issues.

William C. Vickrey, who serves in the constitutionally created position of Administrative Director of the Courts and heads up the AOC, “has an evangelical fervor about reforming California’s judicial system,” noted the Daily Journal (January 31, 1997)—meaning a devotion “to making the judicial system responsive to the changing needs of the public and giving judges the opportunity to treat individual cases individually.” Lawmakers, judges, and others quoted in the article describe Mr. Vickrey as “bright, energetic, and a dynamo of ideas,” “a person of high ideals and values,” and someone with a “willingness to involve everyone in the process.” Regarding himself, Mr. Vickrey reflected: “I sit in the most enviable position in the nation. I am very lucky to be here.” In 1995 the National Center for State Courts described him as the “quintessential public servant” and recognized his progressive approach to court administration by presenting him with its Warren E. Burger Award.
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Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One

Hon. Jamie A. Jacobs-May  
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara

Hon. Dave Jones  
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury  
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl  
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Thomas M. Maddock  
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa

Hon. Charles W. McCoy, Jr.  
Supervising Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Barbara J. Miller  
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Hon. Eileen C. Moore  
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V. Member Roster, 1926–2005

Following is a chronological roster, organized by beginning year of appointment, of the men and women who have served on the Judicial Council since it was established in 1926. The roster is displayed at the entrance of the Judicial Council Conference Center in San Francisco, the headquarters of California’s judicial branch. The current roster, listed in alphabetical order, is available on the California Courts Web site at www.courthio.ca.gov/courtadmin/jc/membership.htm.

1926

*Hon. William H. Waste, 1926–1940
Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. John W. Shenk, 1926–1959
Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. John F. Tyler, 1926–1934
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One, San Francisco

Hon. N. P. Conrey, 1926–1935
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

Hon. William M. Finch, 1926–1930
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento

Hon. T. W. Harris, 1926–1942
Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. Harry A. Hollzer, 1926–1931
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Walter Perry Johnson, 1926–1938
Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Peter J. Shields, 1926–1934
Judge, Superior Court, Sacramento County

Hon. Henry M. Willis, 1926–1930
Presiding Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. W. Cloyd Snyder, 1926–1940
Justice of the Peace and Judge of the City Court, South Pasadena

Mr. B. Grant Taylor, 1926–1942
Clerk of the Supreme Court, Secretary of the Judicial Council

1931

Hon. Victor R. McLucas, 1931–1932
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

1932

Hon. Charles R. Barnard, 1932–1946
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Fresno

Hon. Alden Ames, 1932–1942
Judge, Municipal Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Frank M. Smith, 1932–1942
Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

1934

Hon. John F. Pullen, 1934–1940
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento

Hon. Hilliard Comstock, 1934–1942
Judge, Superior Court, Sonoma County

1935

Hon. Frederick W. Houser, 1935–1937
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

1937

Hon. John T. Nourse, 1937–1946
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two, San Francisco

1938

Hon. Elmer E. Robinson, 1938–1942
Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County
1940

*Hon. Phil S. Gibson, 1940–1964
Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. B. Rey Schauer, 1940–1942
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, Los Angeles

Hon. H. Leonard Kaufman, 1940–1942
Justice of the Peace, Compton Township, Los Angeles County

1944

Hon. John T. York, 1944–1946
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

Hon. Maurice T. Dooling, Jr., 1944–1946
Judge, Superior Court, San Benito County

Hon. C. J. Goodell, 1944–1946
Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Dal M. Lemmon, 1944–1946
Judge, Superior Court, Sacramento County

Hon. Hartley Shaw, 1944–1946
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Lucius P. Green, 1944–1946
Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Mr. A. V. Haskell, 1944
Clerk of the Supreme Court, Secretary of the Judicial Council

1946

Hon. Thomas M. Foley, 1946
Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Andrew R. Schottky, 1946
Judge, Superior Court, Mariposa County

Mr. William I. Sullivan, 1946–1970
Clerk of the Supreme Court, Secretary of the Judicial Council

1948

Hon. Raymond E. Peters, 1948–1950
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One, San Francisco

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, Los Angeles

Hon. Paul Peek, 1948–1950
Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento

Hon. W. Turney Fox, 1948–1950
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. O. D. Hamlin, Jr., 1948–1950
Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Hon. Benjamin C. Jones, 1948–1950
Judge, Superior Court, Lake County

Hon. O. K. Morton, 1948–1950
Judge, Superior Court, Riverside County

Hon. Clarence W. Morris, 1948–1950
Judge, Municipal Court, San Francisco County

Hon. John L. Webster, 1948–1950
Justice of the Peace, Los Angeles County

1953

Hon. A. F. Bray, 1953–1959
Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One, San Francisco

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, Los Angeles

Hon. Lloyd E. Griffin, 1953–1954
Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, San Bernardino

Hon. Melvyn I. Cronin, 1953–1954
Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Hon. Clarence L. Kincaid, 1953–1959
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County

Hon. L. N. Turrentine, 1953–1954
Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County

Judge, Municipal Court, Alameda County

Judge, Justice Court, Santa Barbara County
William H. Waste
Chief Justice and Council Chair, 1926–1940

William Harrison Waste was a native son of California, born in 1868 to pioneer immigrants in Butte County.

In the early 1880s, as a student at Los Angeles High School, William H. Waste spent his spare time watching local courtroom proceedings, following the progress of his favorite trial lawyers. By the time he was admitted to the bar at 25, he had witnessed the courts’ evolution away from the extremes of pioneer justice that had existed when he was born, and he understood the need for change as the courts progressed into a new era.

When the Judicial Council was authorized in 1926, delay and congestion of litigation were a problem throughout the state, most notably in Los Angeles County, where a mere 28 judges presided over a superior court in which the average period between joining of issue and trial of a case was 16 to 18 months. Under the direction of Chief Justice Waste as the first chair of the Judicial Council, and through a statewide mobilization of “judicial manpower,” that delay was soon reduced to 3 months.

Chief Justice Waste chaired the Judicial Council for 14 years, from its inception until 1940.
*Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, San Bernardino*

Hon. Thomas Coakley, 1961  
*Judge, Superior Court, Mariposa County*

Hon. Preston Devine, 1961  
*Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County*

Hon. John D. Foley, 1961–1963  
*Judge, Superior Court, Santa Clara County*

*Judge, Superior Court, Orange County*

*Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County*

*Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County*

*Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County*

*Judge, Justice Court, San Joaquin County*

Hon. Edwin J. Regan, 1961–1965  
*Senator, 5th District*

*Member of the Assembly, 52nd District*

Mr. Burnham Enersen, 1961–1964  
*Attorney at Law, San Francisco*

Mr. Howard J. Finn, 1961–1963  
*Attorney at Law, San Francisco*

Mr. DeWitt A. Higgs, 1961–1963  
*Attorney at Law, San Diego*

**Mr. Ralph N. Kleps, 1961–1977**  
*Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council*

---

**1962**

*Judge, Superior Court, Plumas County*

---

**1963**

*Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles*  
*Associate Justice, Supreme Court*

---

*Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One, San Francisco*

---

*Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County*

---

Hon. George Mellis, 1963–1965  
*Judge, Superior Court, Stanislaus County*

---

Hon. E. Scott Dales, 1963–1967  
*Judge, Municipal Court, Riverside County*

---

*Judge, Justice Court, Solano County*

---

Mr. Frank B. Belcher, 1963–1965  
*Attorney at Law, Los Angeles*

---

Mr. James L. Focht, Jr., 1963–1967  
*Attorney at Law, San Diego*

---

Mr. James A. Wyckoff, 1963–1967  
*Attorney at Law, Watsonville*

---

**1964**

*Associate Justice, Supreme Court*

---

*Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles*

---

Hon. Roy Gargano, 1964–1967  
*Judge, Superior Court, Kern County*

---

*Judge, Superior Court, Napa County*

---

*Judge, Municipal Court, Orange County*

---

Mr. Leonard A. Shelton, 1964–1968  
*Attorney at Law, Pomona*

---

Mr. Samuel H. Wagener, 1964–1968  
*Attorney at Law, Oakland*

---

**1965**

Hon. Donald L. Grunsky, 1965–1973  

---

*Judge, Superior Court, Tulare County*
When Phil S. Gibson was appointed Chief Justice in 1940, he inherited a backlog of pending cases that he managed to clear away in his first two years.

By 1941, after convincing the state Legislature to transfer court rule-making responsibility to the Judicial Council, he was directing the condensation of court rules into everyday English, having brought Bernard E. Witkin, his clerk for many years, to the council for the task. Chief Justice Gibson also pushed through the Legislature a system of municipal and superior courts, with judges either elected by voters or appointed by the Governor, and established the Commission on Judicial Qualifications (now the Commission on Judicial Performance), the first agency in the country to investigate complaints against judges.

“Because Gibson had been a practicing lawyer,” said Mr. Witkin in praise of his colleague, “he had a sense of order and efficiency for tackling the systems of the court…. He brought better equipment, more efficient methods of operation, and better staff to the court, including career law clerks in adequate numbers for all of the justices so that they could face the increasing number of cases. He turned the court into a model for all the nation.”
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Jean Morony, 1969–1973
Judge, Superior Court, Butte County

Judge, Municipal Court, Orange County

Member of the Assembly, 39th District

Mr. Marcus Mattson, 1969–1973
Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

1970

Judge, Municipal Court, San Francisco County

1971

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Two, San Francisco

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, San Diego

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, Los Angeles

Judge, Superior Court, Ventura County

Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County

Hon. Francis McCarty, 1971–1973
Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Justice Court, and Presiding Judge, Superior Court, San Luis Obispo County

Judge, Justice Court, Imperial County

1972

Member of the Assembly, 56th District

Mr. Forrest A. Plant, 1972–1976
Attorney at Law, Sacramento

Mr. Richard R. Rogan, 1972–1976
Attorney at Law, Burbank

1973

Hon. Stanley Mosk, 1973–1975
Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. Melvin E. Cohn, 1973–1977
Judge, Superior Court, San Mateo County

Judge, Superior Court, Yolo County

Hon. R. Donald Chapman, 1973–1977
Judge, Municipal Court, Santa Clara County

Judge, Justice Court, Fresno County

Senator, 28th District

Mr. Thomas M. Jenkins, 1973–1977
Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Mr. William J. Schall, 1973–1977
Attorney at Law, La Jolla

1974

Hon. Alfred J. McCourtney, 1974–1975
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Bruce W. Sumner, 1974–1979
Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Member of the Assembly, 13th District

1975

Hon. Thomas W. Caldecott, 1975–1979
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Four, San Francisco

Hon. Floyd C. Dodson, 1975–1977
Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Santa Barbara County
**Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County**

**Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County**

Hon. Patricia J. Hofstetter, 1975–1979  
**Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County**

Hon. John Irwin, 1975–1977  
**Judge, Justice Court, Lake County**

Hon. John V. Stroud, 1975–1979  
**Judge, Justice Court, Sacramento County**

1976

Hon. Wilfred J. Harpham, 1976–1979  
**Judge, Justice Court, Lake County**

Mr. Joseph W. Cotchett, 1976–1978  
**Attorney at Law, San Mateo**

**Attorney at Law, Sunnyvale**

Mr. Mark P. Robinson, 1976–1977  
**Attorney at Law, Los Angeles**

1977

*Hon. Rose Elizabeth Bird, 1977–1986  
**Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council**

**Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles**

**Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County**

**Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County**

Hon. John V. Stroud, 1975–1979  
**Judge, Justice Court, Sacramento County**

1976

Hon. J. Hilary Cook, 1977–1979  
**Judge, Superior Court, Alpine County**

Hon. William P. Hogoboom, 1977–1979  
**Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County**

Hon. Charles E. Goff, 1977–1979  
**Judge, Municipal Court, San Francisco County**

Mr. Nathaniel S. Colley, 1977–1979  
**Attorney at Law, Sacramento**

Mr. Seth M. Hufstedler, 1977–1978  
**Attorney at Law, Los Angeles**

Mildred L. Lillie  
**Council Member, 1961–1963 and 1987–1989**

“I have lived through monumental economic, social, and legislative changes that have had an impact on the administration of justice,” Justice Mildred L. Lillie once wrote. “I have watched with pride the upsurge of women in the profession.”

Considered one of the pioneers of women’s participation in the judiciary, Justice Lillie entered the male-dominated legal field in 1938. From 1958 until her death in 2002, she served as a presiding justice in the Second Appellate District.

Justice Lillie was known for what some have called her “fierce demeanor”—she would not tolerate incivility in the courtroom. “I have been disheartened by the gradual change in counsel’s respect for each other and for the court, a growing incivility that often rises to the level of acrimony.”

Nonetheless, Justice Lillie regarded other changes as inevitable and necessary. She saw the computer as a critical tool for the delivery of cost-effective legal services. She also believed that the courts, to ensure the fair and impartial administration of justice, must reinvigorate and maintain public confidence by educating citizens through ongoing outreach programs about the court’s role in the community and how the judicial system works.
1978

Hon. Jerry Smith, 1978–1979
Senator, 12th District

Mr. Thomas T. Anderson, 1978–1980
Attorney at Law, India

Mr. E. Dean Price, 1978–1980
Attorney at Law, Modesto

Mr. Edwin J. Wilson, 1978–1981
Attorney at Law, Long Beach

**Mr. Ralph J. Gampell, 1978–1987
Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council

1979

Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Two, San Bernardino

Judge, Superior Court, Shasta County

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Municipal Court, San Joaquin County

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Lewis Wenzell, 1979–1981
Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Judge, Justice Court, Santa Barbara County

Hon. Vivian Quinn, 1979–1983
Judge, Justice Court, Tuolumne County
President, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division One, Los Angeles

Hon. Bob Wilson, 1979–1981
Senator, 39th District

Member of the Assembly, 59th District

Mr. Gregory Munoz, 1979–1981
Attorney at Law, Santa Ana

1980

Hon. Florence Bernstein, 1980–1987
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Mr. Joseph G. Hurley, 1980–1984
Attorney at Law, North Hollywood

Attorney at Law, San Mateo and Burlingame

1981

Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three, San Francisco

Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Senator, 18th District

Hon. Elihu M. Harris, 1981–1989
Member of the Assembly, 13th District

Mr. Peter J. Hughes, 1981–1983
Attorney at Law, San Diego

Attorney at Law, Eureka

1982

Mr. W. Robert Morgan, 1982–1984
Attorney at Law, San Jose

1983

Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, Los Angeles
Ralph N. Kleps
Council Member, 1961–1977

Ralph N. Kleps, a nationally recognized expert in the field of court administration, became California’s first Administrative Director of the Courts in 1961.

The use of information technology first proliferated in the courts during Mr. Kleps’s 16-year tenure. In his 1969 address “Computers and Court Management,” he drew on AOC survey statistics to find that in 1966 only 12 of California’s 58 superior courts were “utilizing data processing equipment.” Despite this low figure, he believed the widespread use of information technology was inevitable and welcome but was no panacea.

“None of us should be unduly optimistic about the possibility that the machines of the future are going to solve the problems of the present,” he warned. “Unless we continue to work like beavers on the problems of the present, keeping an eye on the machines of the future, they will never be able to assist us with those problems when the future arrives.”

In 1991 the Judicial Council instituted the Ralph N. Kleps Awards for Improvement in the Administration of the Courts to honor the contributions made by individual courts to improving access to a fair and impartial judicial system.
Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Brian L. Rix, 1985–1987
Judge, Justice Court, Butte County

Senator, 10th District

1986

Mr. David B. Baum, 1986–1988
Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

1987

Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. David N. Eagleson, 1987–1989
Associate Justice, Superior Court

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento

Hon. Donald B. King, 1987–1989
Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Five, San Francisco

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Cerena Wong, 1987–1989
Judge, Municipal Court, Sonoma County

Judge, Justice Court, Modoc County

Judge, Justice Court, Fresno County

Mr. David M. Heilbron, 1987–1989
Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Attorney at Law, San Pablo

Hon. V. Gene McDonald, 1987–1988 (A)
California Judges Association

Mr. Alan Carlson, 1987–1988 (A)
California Association for Superior Court Administration

Mr. William N. Pierce, 1987–1988 (A)
California Association for Superior Court Administration

1988

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Sacramento County

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County

Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Judge, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Mr. Peter J. Hinton, 1988–1990
Attorney at Law, Walnut Creek

Mr. Don W. Martens, 1988–1990
Attorney at Law, Newport Beach

Mr. Len LeTellier, 1988–1989 (A)
Association for Superior Court Administration

Mr. Wayne Low, 1988–1989 (A)
Association of Municipal Clerks

**Mr. William E. Davis, 1988–1991
Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council
1989
Associate Justice, Supreme Court
Hon. Candace D. Cooper, 1989 (A), 2004–
California Judges Association
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County
Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Eight, Los Angeles
Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three, San Francisco
Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, Fresno
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County
Judge, Municipal Court, Orange County
Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County
Judge, Municipal Court, Orange County
Judge, Justice Court, Calaveras County
Mr. Johnnie L. Cochran, Jr., 1989–1991
Attorney at Law, Los Angeles
Ms. Sharon Baird, 1989 (A)
Association of Municipal Court Clerks

1990
Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles
Associate Justice, Supreme Court
Chief Justice of California, Chair of the Judicial Council
Hon. Patricia Bamattre-Manoukian, 1990–1993,
1993–1995
Justice, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District, San Jose
Hon. Phil Isenberg, 1990–1995
Member of the Assembly, 10th District
Mr. Kevin R. Culhane, 1990–1992
Attorney at Law, Sacramento

Rose Elizabeth Bird
Chief Justice and Council Chair, 1977–1986

In her first address as Chief Justice, Rose Elizabeth Bird warned that the judicial system was becoming “more and more removed” from the people whose rights and interests it was supposed to protect.

Chief Justice Bird, the first woman appointed to the California Supreme Court and the first female Chief Justice, instituted several reforms to engender a public “sense of participation” in the judicial process. She appointed special panels to solicit public comment on such problems as court congestion, promoted televised and photographic coverage of court proceedings at the trial and appellate court levels, and pushed several new statutes and court rules to expedite the disposition of civil cases.

Chief Justice Bird made unprecedented appointments of women and minority judges to the Judicial Council, where she also encouraged extensive use of advisory committees composed of not only judges and lawyers but also educators, journalists, and other members of the public.

Although her rulings made her unpopular with many Californians, several of the reforms Chief Justice Bird proposed and sponsored—such as the landmark State Funding of Trial Courts Act of 1985—were enacted after her tenure.
Ms. Louise A. La Mothe, 1990–1991
Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

California Judges Association
Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Commissioner, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Mr. Kevin A. Swanson, 1990–1992 (A)
Clerk of the Court, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, Fresno

Mr. Ken Torre, 1990–1991 (A)
Executive Officer, Superior Court, San Mateo County

Mr. Howard Hanson, 1990–1996 (A)
County Clerk/Court Administrator, Superior Court, Marin County

Deputy Clerk, Municipal Court, Alameda County

Mr. Bernard E. Witkin, 1990–1995 (A)
Attorney at Law, Berkeley

1991

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, San Bernardino

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, Fresno

Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County

Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County

Judge, Municipal Court, Alameda County

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

Judge, Justice Court, Fresno County

Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Mr. Alan I. Rothenberg, 1991–1992
Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

California Judges Association
Judge, Superior Court, San Bernardino County

Hon. Michael S. Ullman, 1991 (A)
California Judges Association
Judge, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

Mr. Martin J. Mosher, 1991 (A)
Association for Superior Court Administration
County Clerk/Executive Officer, Superior Court, San Bernardino County

Mr. Christopher Crawford, 1991–1992 (A)
Association of Municipal Court Clerks
Court Administrator, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

1992

Hon. Sandra Ann Thompson, 1992–1993
Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Mr. William McCurine, Jr., 1992–1994
Attorney at Law, San Diego

Hon. Ralph Flageollet, 1992 (A)
California Court Commissioners Association
Commissioner, Superior Court, San Francisco County

Mr. Dennis B. Jones, 1992 (A)
Association of Municipal Court Clerks
Clerk/Administrator, Municipal Court, Sacramento County

** Mr. Robert W. Page, Jr., 1992
Acting Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council

** Mr. William C. Vickrey, 1992–
Administrative Director of the Courts, Secretary of the Judicial Council

1993

Justice, Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, Fresno

Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Superior Court, Napa County

Judge, Superior Court, Orange County
Hon. Steven J. Howell, 1993–1996
Presiding Judge, Municipal Court, Butte County

California Court Commissioners Association
Commissioner, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Judge, Justice Court, Mono County

Mr. Stephen Kelly, 1993–1994 (A)
Appellate Court Clerks Association
Clerk, Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, San Bernardino

Mr. Michael A. Tozzi, 1993–1994 (A)
Association for Superior Court Administration
Court Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, Superior Court, Stanislaus County

Mr. Earl S. Bradley, 1993–1994 (A)
Association of Municipal Court Clerks
Court Administrator, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

1994

Justice, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento

Judge, Superior and Municipal Courts, Sacramento County

Judge, Municipal Court, Santa Clara County

Hon. Martin C. Suits, 1994
Judge, Justice Court, Kings County

Senator, 30th District

Mr. Harvey I. Saferstein, 1994–1997
Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Mr. Brian C. Walsh, 1994–1998
Attorney at Law, San Jose

Hon. Eugene Mac Amos, Jr., 1994 (A)
California Judges Association
Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Malcolm M. Lucas
Chief Justice and Council Chair, 1987–1996

Malcolm M. Lucas was appointed Chief Justice following an unprecedented rejection of three sitting Supreme Court justices by the electorate in 1986. He took over a divided court that was the subject of much criticism.

“The more unified our voice, the more effective we will be,” Chief Justice Lucas said as he set about bringing order and efficiency to a judicial system challenged by underfunding and overload. He led the courts through the implementation of the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act, advocated for state funding of all the state’s courts, and restructured the Judicial Council to make it increasingly assume the role of central planner and advocate for the courts. Along with revitalizing the Judicial Council, he renewed interaction and cooperation between the judiciary and the Legislature to solve financial and structural problems. To prepare the courts for the challenges of the future, he organized and chaired the Conference on the State of the California Judiciary in the Year 2020.

“I hope I have left the system a better place than when I entered it,” Chief Justice Lucas said in his 1995 State of the Judiciary address. “I hope each of you will aspire to do the same.”
1995

Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Two, Los Angeles

Judge, Superior Court, Contra Costa County

Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Municipal Court, Tuolumne County

Mr. Dallas Holmes, 1995–1997
Attorney at Law, Riverside

Ms. Glenda Veasey, 1995–1999
Attorney at Law, El Segundo

Hon. Rudolph A. Diaz, 1995 (A)
California Judges Association
Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

California Court Commissioners Association
Commissioner, Superior and Municipal Courts, Sacramento County

Mr. Michael Yerly, 1995–1996 (A)
Appellate Court Clerks Association
Clerk, Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District, San Jose

Mr. Ronald G. Overholt, 1995–1998 (A)
Association for Superior Court Administration
Executive Officer/Clerk, Superior Court, Alameda County

Ms. Sharon A. Gonterman, 1995–1996 (A)
Association of Municipal Court Clerks
Court Administrator, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Judge, Superior Court, Ventura County

Hon. Albert Dover, 1996–1999
Presiding Judge, Municipal Court, Nevada County

Hon. Brenda Harbin-Forte, 1996–1999
Judge, Municipal Court, Alameda County

Hon. Bill Morrow, 1996
Member of the Assembly, 73rd District

Hon. Paul Boland, 1996–2000 (A)
California Judges Association
Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. William F. McDonald, 1996–1997 (A)
California Judges Association
Judge, Superior Court, Orange County

Hon. Nori Anne Walla, 1996–1998 (A)
Commissioner, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Mr. Joseph A. Lane, 1996–1999 (A)
Clerk, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Los Angeles

Ms. Sheila Gonzalez, 1996–1999 (A)
Executive Officer, Superior and Municipal Courts, Ventura County

Mr. Stephen V. Love, 1996–2000 (A)
County Clerk/Executive Officer, Superior Court, Santa Clara County

1996

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter, 1996–
Associate Justice, Supreme Court

Hon. J. Richard Couzens, 1996–2000
Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Placer County

Hon. Carol A. Corrigan, 1997–2001
Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three, San Francisco

Judge, Municipal Court, Los Angeles County

Hon. Michael B. Orfield, 1997–1999
Judge, Municipal Court, San Diego County

Member of the Assembly, 50th District
Senator, 30th District

Mr. Sheldon Sloan, 1997–2000
Attorney at Law, Los Angeles
Bernard E. Witkin
Council Member, 1990–1995

Bernard E. Witkin’s summaries of California law—the eight-foot-long shelf full of books generally known as “Witkin”—have been cited in published state and federal appellate opinions an estimated 100,000 times.

“Witkin” had its genesis in the 1920s, when the brilliant University of California at Berkeley student, who hated studying law by the Socratic method so much that he failed his family law class through poor attendance, began selling his bar review study outlines. The Summary of California Law was begun at a time when California law was far less complex and voluminous. Growing with the field, it became Bernard E. Witkin’s life work.

He first served the Judicial Council in 1939, after Chief Justice Phil S. Gibson convinced the Governor and Legislature that the council should be granted the authority and staff—particularly the indefatigable Mr. Witkin—to write the California court rules. Mr. Witkin, with the titular guidance of a 100-member advisory committee, drafted the state’s first rules on appeal. He was also instrumental in the development of California’s Judicial Education Center.

Although he never became a judge or argued a case in court, it has been said that no case is argued in California without him.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mr. John J. Collins</td>
<td>Attorney at Law, Newport Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hon. David J. Danielsen</td>
<td>California Judges Association, Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mr. Ron D. Barrow</td>
<td>Clerk, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mr. Arthur Sims</td>
<td>Executive Officer, Superior Court, Riverside County and Alameda County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hon. Gail A. Andler</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hon. Aviva K. Bobb</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hon. Brad R. Hill</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hon. Ronald M. Sabraw</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Alameda County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hon. Darrell Steinberg</td>
<td>Member of the Assembly, 9th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Mr. Rex Heeseman</td>
<td>Attorney at Law, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hon. William C. Harrison</td>
<td>California Judges Association, Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Solano County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hon. Wayne L. Peterson</td>
<td>Presiding Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hon. Bobby R. Vincent</td>
<td>Commissioner, Superior Court, San Bernardino County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Mr. Alan Slater</td>
<td>Executive Officer, Superior Court, Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Hon. Norman L. Epstein</td>
<td>Justice, Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Hon. Robert A. Dukes</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Hon. Barbara Ann Zúñiga</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Contra Costa County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas J. Warwick, Jr.</td>
<td>Attorney at Law, San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Hon. Stephen D. Bradbury</td>
<td>California Judges Association, Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Lassen County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Ms. Christine Patton</td>
<td>Executive Officer, Superior Court, Santa Cruz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. Laurence Donald Kay</td>
<td>Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Four, San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. Eric L. DuTemple</td>
<td>Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Tuolumne County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. Jack Komar</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Santa Clara County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. William A. MacLaughlin</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. Heather D. Morse</td>
<td>Judge, Superior Court, Santa Cruz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. Ellen M. Corbett</td>
<td>Member of the Assembly, 18th District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Mr. David J. Pasternak</td>
<td>Attorney at Law, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ms. Ann Miller Ravel</td>
<td>County Counsel, Santa Clara County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. Frederick Paul Horn</td>
<td>Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. Gregory C. O’Brien, Jr.</td>
<td>California Judges Association, Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Hon. Patricia H. Wong</td>
<td>Commissioner, Superior Court, Sacramento County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ms. Tressa S. Kentner</td>
<td>Executive Officer, Superior Court, San Bernardino County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ms. Susan Null</td>
<td>Executive Officer, Superior Court, Shasta County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Hon. Richard E. L. Strauss</td>
<td>Presiding Judge, Superior Court, San Diego County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“You’re supposed to come into this world and try to make it a little better before you leave,” Judge Benjamin Aranda III once said.

Judge Aranda, a native Californian of Mexican ancestry, was a self-made man who devoted his career to helping those less fortunate. He was known for living in close alignment with strongly held values. When he died in 1998 at the age of 58, en route to an American Bar Association conference to receive the Inspirational Spirit of Excellence Award for community service, he left a legacy of commitment to equal justice that one eulogist called “unsurpassable,” as well as a family of 11 children (4 adopted) who were the first Latinos to be honored by the White House as a Great American Family.

Throughout the 20 years he served in the Municipal Court of Los Angeles County, Judge Aranda championed minority rights, particularly the recruiting of minorities into the practice of law and bench appointments. He is perhaps best remembered for his service as founding chair of the Judicial Council’s Access and Fairness Advisory Committee (1994–1997), which spearheaded efforts to promote fairness in the courts for racial and ethnic minorities and persons with disabilities.

In 1999, the council instituted the Aranda Access to Justice Award to honor judges who have demonstrated long-term commitment to improving access to our courts for low- and moderate-income Californians.
Hon. Dave Jones, 2005—
*Member of the Assembly, 9th District*

Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi, 2005—
*Attorney at Law, Fresno*

Mr. Thomas V. Girardi, 2005—
*Attorney at Law, Los Angeles*

Ms. Barbara J. Parker, 2005—
*Chief Assistant City Attorney, City of Oakland*

Hon. Sharon J. Waters, 2005— (A)
*Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Riverside County*

Hon. Terry B. Friedman, 2005— (A)
*California Judges Association*
*Judge, Superior Court, Los Angeles County*

Hon. Ronald E. Albers, 2005— (A)
*Commissioner, Superior Court, San Francisco County*

Ms. Deena Fawcett, 2005— (A)
*Clerk/Administrator, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Sacramento*

Ms. Sharol H. Strickland, 2005— (A)
*Executive Officer, Superior Court, Butte County*
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** = Administrative Director of the Courts
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2006–2007 Judicial Council

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and Chair of the Judicial Council

Mr. Raymond G. Aragon
Attorney at Law

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court

Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Attorney at Law, Fresno

Hon. Candace D. Cooper
Presiding Justice of the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Eight

Hon. J. Stephen Czuleger
Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Joseph Dunn
Member of the California State Senate

Hon. Peter Paul Espinoza
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Mr. Thomas V. Girardi
Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Hon. Richard D. Huffman
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One

Hon. Jamie A. Jacobs-May
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara

Hon. Dave Jones
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Suzanne N. Kingsbury
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of El Dorado

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Thomas M. Maddock
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa

Hon. Charles W. McCoy, Jr.
Supervising Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Barbara J. Miller
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Hon. Eileen C. Moore
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three

Hon. Dennis E. Murray
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Tehama

Ms. Barbara J. Parker
Chief Assistant City Attorney, Office of the City Attorney, Oakland

Hon. James Michael Welch
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Ronald E. Albers
Commissioner of the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

Ms. Tamara Lynn Beard
Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of California, County of Fresno

Ms. Deena Fawcett
Clerk/Administrator of the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Hon. Scott L. Kays
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Solano

Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

Ms. Sharol Strickland
Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of California, County of Butte

Hon. Nancy Wieben Stock
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Orange

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Mr. William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts and Secretary of the Judicial Council

September 2006
2007–2008 Judicial Council

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. George J. Abdallah, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin

Mr. Raymond G. Aragon
Attorney at Law

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the California Supreme Court

Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Attorney at Law, Fresno

Hon. Ellen M. Corbett
Member of the California State Senate

Hon. Peter Paul Espinoza
Assistant Supervising Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Terry B. Friedman
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Mr. Thomas V. Girardi
Attorney at Law, Los Angeles

Hon. Brad R. Hill
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Hon. Richard D. Huffman
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One

Hon. Jamie A. Jacobs-May
Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara

Hon. Dave Jones
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Thomas M. Maddock
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa

Hon. Charles W. McCoy, Jr.
Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Barbara J. Miller
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Hon. Eileen C. Moore
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three

Hon. Dennis E. Murray
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Tehama

Ms. Barbara J. Parker
Chief Assistant City Attorney, Office of the City Attorney

Hon. James Michael Welch
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Ronald E. Albers
Commissioner of the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

Ms. Deena Fawcett
Clerk/Administrator
Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Hon. Ira R. Kaufman
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Plumas

Mr. Michael D. Planet
Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Ventura

Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

Hon. Nancy Wieben Stock
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Orange

Ms. Sharol Strickland
Court Executive Officer, Superior Court of California, County of Butte

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Mr. William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts and Secretary of the Judicial Council
2008-2009 Judicial Council

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. George J. Abdallah, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Joaquin

Mr. Raymond G. Aragon
Attorney at Law

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the California Supreme Court

Hon. Tani Cantil-Sakauye
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Attorney at Law, Fresno

Hon. Ellen M. Corbett
Member of the California State Senate

Hon. Lee Smalley Edmon
Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Peter Paul Espinoza
Assistant Supervising Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Mike Feuer
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Terry B. Friedman
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Brad R. Hill
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal,
Fifth Appellate District

Hon. Richard D. Huffman
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One

Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Los Angeles

Hon. Thomas M. Maddock
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Contra Costa

Mr. Joel S. Miliband
Attorney at Law, Irvine

Hon. Dennis E. Murray
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of Tehama

Mr. James N. Penrod
Attorney at Law, San Francisco

Hon. Winifred Younge Smith
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Alameda

Hon. Sharon J. Waters
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Riverside

Hon. James Michael Welch
Judge of the Superior Court of California,
County of San Bernardino

ADVISORY MEMBERS

Hon. Lon F. Hurwitz
Commissioner of the Superior Court of California, County of Orange

Mr. John Mendes
Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of California, County of Placer

Mr. Michael D. Planet
Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of California, County of Ventura

Mr. Michael M. Roddy
Court Executive Officer of the Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

Hon. Kenneth K. So
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

Hon. Mary E. Wiss
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

Mr. William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts and Secretary of the Judicial Council
2009-2010 Judicial Council

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and Chair of the Judicial Council

Hon. George J. Abdallah, Jr.
Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin

Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Associate Justice of the California Supreme Court

Hon. Tani Cantil-Sakauye
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

Mr. Anthony P. Capozzi
Attorney at Law, Fresno

Hon. Ellen M. Corbett
Member of the California State Senate

Hon. Lee Smalley Edmon
Assistant Presiding Judge of the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles

Hon. Mike Feuer
Member of the California State Assembly

Hon. Brad R. Hill
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

Hon. Richard D. Huffman
Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One
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