



The Capitol Connection

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS • OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

In this Issue

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Court Security, Facilities Focus of Judicial Council Special Hearing</i> | 1 |
| <i>Legislator Profile: Assembly Member Alberto Torrico</i> | 1 |
| <i>Update on Judicial Council sponsored Legislation</i> | 2 |
| <i>Frequently-asked Questions about SB 56: New Judgeships</i> | 2 |
| <i>Legislative Review</i> | 3 |
| <i>Bench-Bar Coalition Returns to the Capitol in May</i> | 8 |

Legislative Calendar

May 20
Last day for policy committees to meet prior to June 6.

May 27
Last day for fiscal committees to meet prior to June 6.

COURT SECURITY, FACILITIES FOCUS OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL SPECIAL HEARING

“Protecting Access to Justice in California” was the focus of a special Judicial Council hearing held on April 14 in San Francisco. The 27-member council heard testimony from members of the public, law enforcement, and the legal community.

The witnesses spoke about the impact of an insufficient number of judges to hear crowded court calendars, inadequate court security, crumbling and crowded facilities, and threats to the independence of the judiciary.

Safety and security in the courts was a key concern, as the hearing came in the wake of the courthouse shootings in Atlanta, Georgia, and the slashing of an attorney in a San Fernando Valley courtroom. In

addition, the witnesses spoke of the increasing number of courthouses that are structurally unable to accommodate the rapid population growth and ensuing court caseloads.

The hearing, coordinated by a multi-divisional team from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), was audio-cast via the Internet and taped for statewide broadcast on the California Channel.



Judge Jim Mize and AOC Chief Deputy Director Ronald Overholt listen to testimony during the Judicial Council Special hearing.

Before the testimony began, Chief Justice Ronald M. George welcomed the 26 witnesses and invited guests. In his opening remarks, Chief Justice George referenced his State of the Judiciary address (see *Chief Justice Voices Judicial Branch Priorities to the Legislature, March 2005*) in which he emphasized the

(Continued on page 6)

LEGISLATOR PROFILE: ASSEMBLY MEMBER ALBERTO TORRICO



Alberto Torrico, one of the seven new attorneys in the Legislature, was elected to the California State Assembly in November 2004 to represent the 20th Assembly District, which includes Fremont, Newark, Union City, Milpitas and parts of San Jose, Hayward, Castro Valley and Pleasanton.

Assembly Member Torrico began his public service career as a policy aide for then-Santa Clara County Supervisor Ron Gonzales, focusing on criminal justice and transportation issues, including working to extend Bay Area Rapid Transit to San Jose.

From 1996 to 1999, he was an associate at Weinberg, Roger

& Rosenfeld in Oakland and Los Angeles, specializing in labor law. He is admitted to practice in each of the federal district courts in California and has taught labor and employment law at San Jose City College.

Torrico returned to the public sector in 2000 as assistant general counsel at the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority in San Jose. Recognizing that people need to spend less time on the road and more time with their families, he worked with businesses, labor groups and local cities to address pressing regional traffic problems.

In 2001, he opened a private law practice in Fremont, where he worked with unions, took individual employee-rights cases and did criminal defense work, incorpora-

(Continued on page 7)

UPDATE ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL-SPONSORED LEGISLATION

New Judgeships/SJO Conversions

Senate Bill 56 (Dunn), the Judicial Council-sponsored bill to create 150 new judgeships over a three-year period, passed the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 26 with a 6-1 vote and has been referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Senator Ducheny and Assembly Member Jones are principal co-authors and Assembly Members Benoit and Bogh are co-authors. In addition to the proposed 150 new judgeships, the judgeship bill includes provisions that would allow for the conversion of up to 161 eligible subordinate judicial officer positions to judgeships.

Senator Dunn indicated his intent to amend the bill to specify the new judgeships and SJO positions by court. At the hearing, numerous witnesses testified in support of the judgeship bill, including judges from Fresno, Sacramento, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties, the Sheriff and District Attorney of San Bernardino County, the Chief of Police from the City of Corona, and attorneys in civil and criminal practice from Riverside, the Bay Area, and Sacramento.

For more information about SB 56, see *Frequently-asked Questions about SB 56* in this issue or contact Eraina Ortega at eraina.ortega@jud.ca.gov.

Court Facilities Bond

Senate Bill 395 (Escutia), which authorizes the placement of a bond measure for court facilities on the 2006 ballot, passed the Senate Judiciary Committee with a 5-2 vote on April 26. The bill has been referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Senator Martha Escutia (D-Whittier), joined by judges from San Bernardino, Riverside, Fresno, and Sacramento, stressed the need to secure funding for adequate, safe, and functional court facilities throughout the state.

For more information on SB 395, contact Eraina Ortega at eraina.ortega@jud.ca.gov.

Uniform Civil Fee Proposal

In April 2004, the Court Fees Working Group (CFWG) made unanimous recommendations on a statewide uniform civil fee structure. The Uniform Civil Fee (UCF) proposal will streamline and vastly simplify the civil fee structure, provide for uniformity across the state, and address the funding shortfall under the current fee structure.

The UCF proposal will be submitted to the Legislature for inclusion in a budget trailer bill so that the new fee structure will be approved upon passage of the state budget, but will likely take effect at a later date specified in the bill. The delayed effective date will allow courts sufficient time to implement the new structure. A full draft of the UCF can be found at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/civilfees.htm.

For more information on the UCF, contact Eraina Ortega at eraina.ortega@jud.ca.gov.

Judges' Retirement

Senate Bill 528 (Ackerman and Dunn), as introduced on February 18, 2005, declares the Legislature's intent to evaluate the impact of trial court unification on the judges' retirement systems and the resulting increase in judges' ages at the start

(Continued on page 5)

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT SB 56: NEW JUDGESHIPS

California is suffering from a severe shortage of trial court judgeships. The ramifications are serious and far-reaching, and include compromised public safety; decreased access to the courts; an unstable business climate; and enormous backlogs that inhibit fair, timely, and equitable justice. Senate Bill 56 (Dunn) addresses the critical shortage of judgeships.

How many judges are needed statewide?

A 2004 report to the California Judicial Council, Update of Judicial Needs Study—following up on the California Judicial Needs Assessment Project of 2001—identified a statewide need for 355 new judgeships in trial courts. Although the project identified a need for approximately 355 judgeships, the Judicial Council is requesting only

the most critically needed 150 judgeships over the next three years, in consideration of the state's ongoing fiscal crisis.

How does SB 56 address the problem?

Sponsored by the Judicial Council, SB 56 has been introduced to create 150 new judicial positions, prioritizing the courts with the greatest need. The bill requires an appropriation for the costs of the additional judges as well as complementary staff support. It is expected that SB 56 will also be amended to permit the courts to convert eligible subordinate judicial officer (SJO) positions to judgeships.

Why is there a shortage of judges?

There are three main reasons:

(Continued on page 7)

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

The following is an update of the first year of the 2005-2006 legislative session on selected bills of interest to the courts. (♦ denotes bills first reported in this issue.)

COURT OPERATIONS

AB 176 (Bermúdez), as introduced. Trial courts: limited-term employees.

Existing law prohibits the employment of any temporary employee in the trial court for a period exceeding 180 calendar days, except for court reporters under certain conditions. This bill would prohibit the employment of any limited-term law clerk employed in the Los Angeles trial court for a period exceeding 180 calendar days. The bill would further provide that any limited-term law clerk employed by Los Angeles court for more than 180 calendar days is a regular employee.

Status: Assembly Appropriations. Set for hearing May 4, 2005.

JC Position: Oppose.

♦ **AB 759 (Lieber), as amended April 4, 2005. Misdemeanors: penalty assessments.**

Authorizes a county board of supervisors in a county that has established a local Crime Stoppers Program to levy a new penalty assessment of up to \$2, upon every fine, penalty, or forfeiture imposed and collected by the courts for misdemeanor criminal offenses.

Notes: The penalty assessment authorized by the bill presents problems for court case management systems since it only applies to misdemeanor offenses.

Status: Assembly Public Safety.

JC Position: Oppose unless amended or funded.

SB 56 (Dunn), as amended April 18, 2005. New judgeships.

Authorizes 150 additional judges for assignment to the various counties, as determined by the Judicial Council. Additionally, authorizes conversion of 161 subordinate judicial offices.

Status: Senate Appropriations. Set for hearing May 9, 2005.

JC Position: Sponsor

SB 57 (Alarcón), as amended on April 25, 2005. Fines and forfeitures.

Authorizes a county board of supervisors to levy a new \$2 penalty assessment for every \$10, upon every fine, penalty, or forfeiture imposed and collected by the courts for specified criminal offenses. In addition, a county board can levy another \$2 penalty assessment for every \$10 upon every fine, penalty, or forfeiture

imposed and collected by the courts for seat belt, speed limit, DUI and domestic violence violations. Counties have discretion to spend up to 15 percent of the revenue generated on trauma care facilities that provide pediatric trauma care.

Notes: The second \$2 assessment presents problems for court case management systems since it only applies to four categories of offenses.

Status: Passed Senate.

JC Position: Oppose

SB 395 (Escutia), as introduced. Court facilities bond.

Enacts the California Court Facilities Bond Act of 2006 to acquire, rehabilitate, construct, and finance court facilities.

Status: Senate Appropriations.

JC Position: Sponsor

CRIMINAL

AB 106 (Cohn), as amended March 8, 2005. Spousal battery: fines: amnesty.

Requires the courts of each county to establish a one-time amnesty program, based upon Judicial Council guidelines, for fines, bail, and other monetary obligations that are imposed for certain domestic violence offenses that have been delinquent for not less than six months as of January 1, 2006. Provides that the amount scheduled by the court shall be 70 percent of the total fines, fees, penalties, or assessments imposed. The Judicial Council is opposed to this bill because it is inconsistent with the recommendations of the SB 940 Court County Working Group on Enhanced Collections. If you have information on the costs of operating an amnesty program, please contact tracy.kenny@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee. Suspense File.

JC Position: Oppose

♦ **AB 1542 (Parra), as amended April 11, 2005. Crimes by veterans: sentencing.**

Expands existing law governing the court's sentencing authority applicable to combat veterans of Vietnam who have substance abuse or psychological problems related to that service and are convicted of a felony to apply to a combat veteran of any war who has been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor, and suffers from post traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, or psychological or emotional problems as a result of that service.

Status: Assembly Appropriations.

JC Position: No position.

AB 1551 (Runner), as introduced. Sexual predators.

Strengthens the sentencing scheme for sexual assault on

(Continued on page 4)

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

(Continued from page 3)

children and, among other things, prohibits a court from striking an allegation, admission, or finding of a prior conviction pursuant to Penal Code section 1385 for defendants who are convicted of certain sex offenses.

Sponsor: California District Attorneys Association

Notes: The Judicial Council is opposed to AB 1551 unless it is amended to strike the provision eliminating the court's authority under Penal Code section 1385 to dismiss an action in the furtherance of justice. The council has long advocated that, while the discretion is not absolute, dismissal of an action in the furtherance of justice is within the court's "exclusive discretion."

Status: Assembly Appropriations.

JC position: Oppose unless amended.

SB 330 (Cedillo), as amended March 29, 2005. Criminal proceedings: mental competency.

Requires a criminal action to be dismissed if a defendant in a misdemeanor or infraction case is not brought to trial within 30 days after the date of the reinstatement of criminal proceedings pursuant to the provisions of law governing the mental competency of defendants.

Sponsor: Los Angeles City Attorney.

Status: Passed Senate.

JC position: Support

SB 864 (Poochigian), as amended April 27, 2005. Sexually violent predators: term of commitment

Authorizes commitment as a sexually violent predator to the state Department of Mental Health for a four-year term rather than for a two-year term for treatment of the person's diagnosed mental disorder if the person is adjudicated to be likely to engage in sexually violent criminal behavior if discharged. Requires that courts give a preference in scheduling commitment trials over all other civil matters.

Sponsor: California District Attorneys Association. To comment, contact June Clark at june.clark@jud.ca.gov or (916) 323-3121.

Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

JC position: No position

CIVIL PROCEDURE

AB 496 (Aghazarian), as amended April 26, 2005.

Service of process: retention of original summons in court file.

Existing law provides that a plaintiff may have the clerk

issue one or more summons for any defendant. Among other things, this bill would require the clerk to maintain the original summons in the court file.

Status: Passed Assembly.

AB 1459 (Canciamilla), as amended April 26, 2005 in Assembly Judiciary Committee.

Among other things, increases the small claims court jurisdiction over actions brought by a natural person from \$5,000 to \$10,000. Increases the filing fee for cases in which the jurisdictional limit is between \$5,000 and \$7,500 by \$5, and for cases in which the jurisdictional limit is between \$7,500 and \$10,000 by \$10, with the increases in fees to be used for enhancement of advisory services. Requires temporary judges, prior to serving in small claims court, to take a specified course of study offered by the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 312 (Ackerman), as introduced. Summary judgment.

Existing law requires that notice of a motion for summary judgment and supporting papers

shall be served on all other parties to the action at least 75 days before the time appointed for hearing.

This bill would make an exception to that requirement if the court for good cause orders otherwise or the parties stipulate otherwise. The bill would additionally authorize a party to move for summary adjudication of a legal issue or claim for damages, other than punitive damages, that does not completely dispose of a cause of action, an affirmative defense, or an issue of duty according to specified procedures.

Status: Senate Judiciary Committee. 2-yr bill.

SB 422 (Simitian), as amended May 3, 2005.

Among other things, increases the small claims court jurisdiction over actions brought by a natural person from \$5,000 to \$7,500. Increases the filing fee for cases in which the jurisdictional limit exceeds \$5,000 from \$20 to \$25, with the \$5 increase in fees to be used for enhancement of advisory services. Requires temporary judges, prior to serving in small claims court, to take a specified course of study offered by the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

FAMILY

AB 104 (Cohn), as amended March 1, 2005. Protective orders: dismissal.

Provides that a domestic violence protective order may be dismissed by the issuing judge, to the extent feasible, upon written stipulation filed with the court or on the motion of a

(Continued on page 5)

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

(Continued from page 4)

party to terminate the order prior to its expiration date.

Status: Passed Assembly.

JC Position: Oppose

AB 118 (Cohn), as amended March 9, 2005. Protective orders: minor children.

Requires that child custody orders must reference a criminal protective order issued in cases where a criminal protective order protects the custodial parent and provides that contact between a restrained parent and a protected parent shall be for safe exchange only.

Status: Passed Assembly.

JUDICIAL OFFICERS

AB 1595 (Evans), as introduced. Public safety officials: confidentiality

Prohibits a person, business, or association from selling or trading for value on the Internet the home address or telephone number of any elected or appointed official if that official has made a written demand of that person, business, or association to not disclose his or her home address or telephone number.

Sponsor: Author

Notes: Product of 2004 Final Report of the Public Safety Officials' Home Protection Act Advisory Task Force. Council to seek amendment allowing public safety official to submit opt-out request to Secretary of State for inclusion in "opt-out registry."

Status: Assembly Floor.

JC position: Support

SB 506 (Poochigian), as introduced. Voter records: confidentiality

Extends existing voter registration confidentiality programs for "Victims of Domestic Violence and Stalking" and "Reproductive Health Care Services Providers, Employees, Volunteers, and Patients" to include public safety officials if his or her employer certifies that he or she is a public safety official.

Sponsor: Author

Notes: Product of 2004 Final Report of the Public Safety Officials' Home Protection Act Advisory Task Force.

Status: Senate Appropriations.

JC position: Support

JUVENILE DEPENDENCY

SB 218 (Scott), as introduced. Termination of parental rights: prospective adoptive parents.

Authorizes the court to designate specified caretakers as prospective adoptive parents in cases where a dependent child's parents have had their rights terminated, and the child has resided with the caretaker for at least six months, and the caretaker has expressed an interest in adopting the child. Where the court makes this designation, a child could not be removed from the home of that caretaker until a noticed hearing had been conducted to determine that such removal was in the child's best interests.

Status: Senate Appropriations. Set for hearing May 9, 2005.

PROBATE

SB 390 (Bowen), as amended April 27, 2005. Probate assignments: cash advances.

Existing law provides for the regulation of the distribution of an estate. This bill would regulate the assignment of a beneficiary's entire or partial interest in an estate in consideration for a cash advance or any other consideration, as specified. Among other things, the bill would require the agreement to be filed with the court, would require specified disclosures with regard to costs and fees, and would prohibit an assignment agreement form containing certain provisions, including, but not limited to, a binding arbitration clause. The bill would further authorize the court to modify or refuse to order that assignment under specified circumstances, and would allow for specified damages upon a willful violation of the above-described provisions.

Status: Senate Floor. ■

UPDATE ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL-SPONSORED LEGISLATION

(Continued from page 2)

of their judicial service. This bill will serve as the vehicle for proposed changes to the judges' retirement systems during the 2005-2006 Legislative Session. The Judicial Council and the California Judges Association are co-sponsoring the effort to modify the defined benefit structure of JRS II as follows:

- Decrease the minimum retirement age from 65 to 63.
- Allow judges to receive a defined benefit retirement at age 63 and older, calculated based on a formula of 3.75 percent of salary for each year of service, subject to a minimum of at least 10 years of service.

For more information on SB 528, contact June Clark at june.clark@jud.ca.gov. ■

COURT SECURITY, FACILITIES FOCUS OF JUDICIAL COUNCIL SPECIAL HEARING

(Continued from page 1)

council’s resolve to draw attention to the public safety risks and the pressing need to address them in courthouses throughout the state. The Chief Justice also acknowledged the three hearings held earlier this year by Senator Joseph Dunn (see *Courts Testify at Senate Hearing on Trial Court Facilities, Security and Access to Justice, February 2005*) that focused on similar issues.

Julia Wilson, director of the Legal Aid Association of California and a member of the Bench-Bar Coalition, was instrumental in coordinating the appearance of many of the public witnesses – some from as far away as San Diego. While some witnesses spoke positively about their access to the courts, others described situations where they believed they were harmed by insufficient access to court programs and services. Among the public witnesses attending with their legal services representatives:

- Esperanza De La Rosa, speaking through AOC interpreter Berta Bejarano, described how the Family Law Access Partnership at the Larsen Justice Center in Indio helped her manage the paperwork and process of a difficult divorce.
- Raymond Pinkston of San Francisco described how he lost his business, family, and home because he was unable to travel between Northern and Southern California courts to clear up a matter of mistaken identity in a traffic case.
- Nancy Miljas of San Diego testified that while involved in a civil case to save her family home of over 50 years, she had great difficulty navigating her local courthouse, which was ill-equipped to aid persons with physical disabilities.
- Richard Devylder of Sacramento recounted his difficulty in participating in jury service in a courthouse with doors or restrooms that did not accommodate physically disabled persons with physical disabilities.
- Rose Madsen of San Bernardino, whose 20-year-old daughter was the innocent victim of a gang-involved shooting, spoke of the fear and intimidation that many victims’ families face when attending trials in court-



Raymond Pinkston asks the council to look into processes that pose barriers to court users.



A photo of her daughter, Jennifer, rests on the witness table during Rose Madsen’s testimony.

houses with inadequate screening or weapons searches.

- Daisy Martinez of Oakland reported that she and others in her community find it difficult to provide support to family members involved in court proceedings

because of lack of child care services.

The Judicial Council has legislative proposals pending that address the need for additional judges and court facilities (see *Update on Judicial Council-sponsored Legislation* in this issue). In response to the testimony, council members called for more public involvement in bringing the concerns to the attention of state legislators.

The final hearing witnesses testified on the need to maintain an independent judiciary during a time when judicial officers are being personally and professionally targeted because of decisions made on the bench. Finally, the council heard testimony that placed California in perspective with courts around the nation that are also challenged with shrinking budgets, diminishing resources, and increasing threats to judicial officers. A representative of the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) stated that California’s need for additional judges is by far the highest of all states the NCSC has evaluated.



Court leaders and members of the legal community testify on the need for adequate funding for court facilities improvements.

For a complete list of witnesses or to listen to the full hearing, visit the California Courts’ Web site at www.courtinfo.ca.gov, Click on Court Admin, then Judicial Council, and scroll down to the link for the April 14 agenda and audiocast.

For more information on the council hearing, contact the Office of Governmental Affairs at 916-323-3121 or email Dia Poole at dia.poole@jud.ca.gov. ■

LEGISLATOR PROFILE

(Continued from page 1)

tions for small businesses, and wills and trusts.

Torricono served three years as an elected member of the Newark City Council, including a stint as Vice Mayor, before winning election to the Assembly, where he serves as Assistant Majority Whip and is a member of the Assembly committees on Transportation, Housing and Community Development, and Governmental Organization.

As chair of the Assembly Committee on Public Employees, Retirement and Social Security, Assembly Member Torricono is authoring four pension-reform bills this year, including measures to address disability fraud as well as the rising and unpredictable costs of public pensions.

“We need to stop playing politics with pensions,” Torricono said. “My common sense ideas will put our pension systems on sound financial footing, provide stability for local governments, save taxpayers’ money now and protect public employees’ retirement funds.”

Torricono’s parents are immigrants and his mother is of Japanese descent. As a result, he is a member of the Assembly Latino Caucus and the Assembly Asian Pacific Islander Caucus – the first person ever to belong to both groups.

In 1991, Torricono became the first member of his family to graduate from college when he earned his Bachelor of Science degree in political science from Santa Clara University. He went on to earn a juris doctorate at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in 1995.

Torricono also serves on a number of community boards, including Second Chance and Kidango, and the advisory boards of Justice for New Americans and the Alameda County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

“Ultimately, I volunteer in my community and serve as an elected official to honor my parents,” Torricono said. “I believe that it should not be as hard to fulfill the American dream as it was for my parents.”

He and his wife Raquel live in Newark with their four-year-old son, Mateo, and infant daughter, Amy-Elyzabeth. ■

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT SB 56: NEW JUDGESHIPS

(Continued from page 2)

1. **Trial court judicial positions have not kept pace with population growth.** Since 1989 the Legislature has created only 41 judgeships, representing less than 3 percent total growth. In contrast, California’s population grew by more than 30 percent during the same period. Fast-growing counties are precisely where courts face the most critical need for judicial officers—and precisely where the Judicial Council proposes adding the greatest numbers of new judges.

2. **Population growth drives growth in caseloads.** The judicial branch has virtually no control over its workload—it is constitutionally required to take all cases. A court’s workload expands with its community. New businesses increase the demand for civil courts; more people increase the need for family law courts; more law enforcement increases the need for criminal courts. And all Californians are entitled to fair, accessible justice.

3. **Pro per filings increase judges’ responsibilities.** The growing number of self-represented litigants has posed a serious challenge to judges. Litigants unfamiliar with the law require special attention from judges, often causing delays. Family law cases with self-represented litigants are the most frequently filed and require the greatest level of judicial assistance.

What are the consequences of the judicial shortage?

The shortage has a serious negative impact on Californians seeking redress in our state’s trial courts. Here’s how:

- **Access diminishes.** Every citizen is constitutionally entitled to impartial and timely dispute resolution through the courts.
- **Public safety is compromised.** Criminal defendants have a constitutional right to a speedy trial, and charges must be dismissed if deadlines are missed. A shortage of judges makes it difficult to manage calendars efficiently while ensuring that dangerous criminals will not be required to be released.
- **The business climate is destabilized.** Criminal cases must be heard within 90 days of filing, and thus take priority over all other legal matters. As a result, civil justice suffers as courts postpone civil cases—up to 18 months, in some courts—in order to address criminal trials. This creates uncertainty in the business community, which cannot rely on timely resolution of contract disputes.

Will SJO conversions be enough to fix the shortage?

No. The California Judicial Needs Assessment Project did not differentiate between judges and SJOs—both were counted as existing resources. This means that converting an SJO position to a judgeship has no net effect on a court’s existing judicial resources or its need for additional judicial resources. ■



Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the Courts
Office of Governmental Affairs

770 L Street, Suite 700
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone 916-323-3121
Fax 916-323-4347

Editor-in-Chief

Dia S. Poole

Contributors

June Clark
Kate Howard
Tracy Kenny
Eraina Ortega
Daniel Pone
Shaun Young

Story Manager

Christina Fonseca

Production Staff

Yvette Trevino
Michele Williamson

Subscribe Today!

The Capitol Connection is delivered electronically each month to subscribers at no charge.

To subscribe, contact
Yvette Trevino at
916-323-3121,
yvette.trevino@jud.ca.gov.

Archives

Looking for a past issue of *The Capitol Connection*? Find it online at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/aoc/capconn.htm.

BENCH-BAR COALITION RETURNS TO THE CAPITOL IN MAY

The Bench-Bar Coalition (BBC) will return to the State Capitol on May 25 to meet with legislators and key staff on the judicial branch budget and legislative priorities. This second round of visits (see *BBC Impact Felt at the State Capitol, March 2005*) is timed to coincide with the release of the May Revision to the state budget, fiscal hearings on bills in Assembly and Senate appropriations committees, and ongoing negotiations on specific budget items.

BBC membership includes judges and the leadership of local, minority, women's or specialty bar associations, legal services organizations, or statewide organizations dedicated to improving the justice system. The BBC is co-chaired by Miriam Krinsky, executive director of the Children's Law Center of Los Angeles, and Anthony Capozzi, immediate past president of the State Bar of California.

To register for the Day in Sacramento event or for more information about the BBC, please contact Christina Fonseca in the Administrative Office of the Courts' Office of Governmental Affairs at (916) 323-3121 or christina.fonseca-t@jud.ca.gov.



BBC member Mary Viviano of the State Bar talks with Assembly Judiciary Committee Chair Dave Jones during the March Day in Sacramento.

Upcoming BBC Activities:

- ◆ **Thursday, May 12, 2005, 4:00 - 5:00p.m.**
Briefing call for Day in Sacramento Participants
- ◆ **Wednesday, May 25, 2005, 8:00a.m. - 5:00p.m.**
Day in Sacramento visits with legislators at State Capitol
- ◆ **Monday, July 18, 2005, 4:00 - 5:00p.m.**
BBC Membership quarterly conference call
- ◆ **Friday, September 9, 2005, 8:00 - 10:30a.m.**
BBC Membership Meeting, San Diego Marriott Hotel and Marina and San Diego Convention Center. Held in conjunction with the State Bar of California Annual Meeting, the California Judges Association Annual Meeting, and the California Judicial Administration Conference.

News From the AOC

In addition to *The Capitol Connection*, the Administrative Office of the Courts publishes several newsletters reporting on various aspects of court business. Visit these online on the California Courts Web site at www.courtinfo.ca.gov. To subscribe to these newsletters, contact pubinfo@jud.ca.gov.

CFCC Update: Reports on developments in juvenile and family law, including innovative programs, case law summaries from the AOC's Center for Families, Children and the Courts; grants and resources, and updates on legislation and rules and forms. Published three times a year. See www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/resources/publications/newsletter.htm.