



# The Capitol Connection

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS • OFFICE OF GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

## In this Issue

Conference Committee Agrees on Judicial Branch Budget	1
New Traffic Laws Take Effect in September	1
Legislator Profile: Assembly Member Pedro Nava	1
Update on Judicial Council-sponsored Legislation	2
Legislative Review	3
Symposium Held on Implementation of AB 129 (Cohn)	6
Legislature Seeks to Enhance Protective Order Provisions	8

## Legislative Calendar

July 15, 2005  
Summer Recess begins on adjournment provided Budget Bill has been passed.

## CONFERENCE COMMITTEE AGREES ON JUDICIAL BRANCH

The Legislature's Budget Conference Committee completed its work on the State Budget on Friday, June 10. At the beginning of the Conference Committee process, over \$300 million in judicial branch funding was in jeopardy, but the committee restored most of that amount. The budget may still undergo significant changes before it is ultimately passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor. The following are the Conference Committee actions affecting the courts:

- Approved \$130.7 million in new funding for the trial courts pursuant to the State Appropriations Limit (SAL) adjustment formula.
- Approved \$92.6 million for the

*(Continued on page 6)*

## NEW TRAFFIC LAWS TAKE EFFECT IN SEPTEMBER

Changes to state law regarding how the courts deal with driving-under-the-influence (DUI) offenders and holders of commercial licenses will take effect on September 20, 2005. These changes are the result of legislation enacted in 2004 that sought to simplify the imposition of drivers license sanctions as a result of a DUI and to ensure compliance with federal regulations.

SB 1697 (Torlakson), Stats. 2004, ch. 551, consolidated all drivers license sanctions, such as suspension of the driving privilege and placement of restrictions on when and where an offender may drive, under the administration of the Department of Motor Vehicles. Prior to this change, both the courts and the DMV had overlapping authority to impose these sanctions, which resulted in confusion on the part of offenders. An offender could successfully

*(Continued on page 2)*

## LEGISLATOR PROFILE: ASSEMBLY MEMBER PEDRO NAVA

*This is the final article in our series on newly-elected attorneys in the State Legislature.*

Assembly Member Pedro Nava was elected to the State Assembly on November 2nd, 2004, representing the 35th District, which includes the cities of Santa Barbara, Ventura, Oxnard, Goleta and Carpinteria. He currently serves as Chair of the Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 5 on Information Technology/Transportation. Mr. Nava serves on the Assembly Budget, Higher Education, Insurance, Natu-



ral Resources, and Joint Legislative Audit and Budget Committees. Additionally, Nava sits on the Assembly Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention, the Select Committee on Ports and the Assembly Select Committee on Wine. Recently, he was selected by Assembly Speaker Fabian Núñez to serve on the California Ocean Protection Council. The Council is charged with coordinating and improving protection and management of California's ocean and coastal resources.

"I am working hard to advocate for the residents of my district by protecting our environment and our economy, fighting for education, addressing our health care crisis and working to help parents spend more time with their

*(Continued on page 7)*

## UPDATE ON JUDICIAL COUNCIL-SPONSORED LEGISLATION

### New Judgeships/SJO Conversions

Senate Bill 56 (Dunn), the Judicial Council-sponsored bill that proposes the creation of new judgeships and the conversion of certain eligible subordinate judicial officers, will be heard in the Assembly Judiciary Committee on July 5. As they had done when the bill was in the Senate, presiding judges and executive officers of trial courts, bar association leadership, and Bench-Bar Coalition member organizations again sent letters of support to legislators. The bill is anticipated to be amended in the Assembly to specify by court the new judgeships and eligible SJO conversions.

For more information about SB 56 contact Eraina Ortega at [eraina.ortega@jud.ca.gov](mailto:eraina.ortega@jud.ca.gov).

### Court Facilities Bond

Senate Bill 395 (Escutia), which states the intent of the Legislature to enact the California Court Facilities Bond Act of 2006 to acquire, rehabilitate, construct, and finance court facilities, passed the Senate floor on June 1 by a 24-12 vote. The bill was amended to omit the amount of the proposed bond. The bill is now in the Assembly Judiciary Committee, but has yet to be set for hearing. If approved by the Legislature and the Governor, the bond would be placed on the ballot in an upcoming statewide election.

For more information on SB 395, contact Eraina Ortega at [eraina.ortega@jud.ca.gov](mailto:eraina.ortega@jud.ca.gov).

### Uniform Civil Fee Proposal

In April 2004, the Court Fees Working Group (CFWG) made unanimous recommendations for 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 has been amended into AB 1742 (Assembly Judiciary Committee), which will be heard in the Senator Judiciary Committee on July 5. A full draft of the UCF which, if passed, would take effect on Jan 1, 2006, can be found at [www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/civilfees.htm](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/civilfees.htm).

For more information on the UCF, contact Eraina Ortega at [eraina.ortega@jud.ca.gov](mailto: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 of their judicial service. This bill, co-sponsored with the California Judges Association, is a two-year bill, allowing the council to report to the Legislature on the effectiveness of JRS II based on the ten years of experience under the new system. This assessment of JRS II's effectiveness is required by supplemental reporting language currently pending in the budget.

For more information on SB 528, contact June Clark at [june.clark@jud.ca.gov](mailto:june.clark@jud.ca.gov).

---

## NEW TRAFFIC LAWS TAKE EFFECT IN SEPTEMBER

*(Continued from page 1)*

petition the court for a restricted, rather than a suspended, license, only to be told by DMV that his or her driving privilege must remain suspended.

By making all drivers license sanctions part of DMV's administrative procedures for responding to drivers with DUI convictions, this bill ensures that appropriate sanctions will be imposed. Appropriate sanctions are also ensured by the provision in the bill that allows a court, considering the circumstances of a particular case, to disallow the issuance of a restricted license when an offender may otherwise be allowed to drive with restrictions under the administrative process.

AB 3049 (Committee on Transportation), Stats. 2004, ch. 952, ensured California's compliance with federal regulations regarding whether commercial drivers may

attend traffic violator school. Under this new law, commercial drivers may not be permitted to attend traffic violator school or other court-approved program of traffic safety instruction in lieu of adjudication of an offense. Also, no driver, regardless of license class, may be allowed to attend traffic violator school or other court-approved program of traffic safety instruction in lieu of adjudication of an offense if the offense occurred in commercial vehicle.

AB 3049 did not require any changes to the Notice to Appear form used by law enforcement so that the form would indicate whether a commercial driver or a commercial vehicle was involved in a traffic offense. However, funding was successfully sought to offset the courts' cost to modify case management systems and to look up DMV information prior to entering a citation into the courts' systems.

The federal regulations that resulted in AB 3049 required compliance by September 30, 2005. ■

## 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.

### COURT OPERATIONS

**AB 176 (Bermúdez), as amended April 21, 2005. 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.

**Sponsor:** Association of Federal, State, County, and Municipal Employees

**Status:** Senate Judiciary Committee

**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 Committee. 2-year bill.

**JC Position:** Oppose unless amended or funded.

**SB 56 (Dunn), as amended May 26, 2005. New judgeships.**

Authorizes an undetermined number of additional judges for appointment to the various counties, as determined by the Judicial Council. Additionally, authorizes conversion of an undetermined number of subordinate judicial officers.

**Status:** Assembly Judiciary Committee; set for hearing on July 5, 2005

**JC Position:** Sponsor

**SB 57 (Alarcón), as amended May 26, 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. Revenue gener-

ated would be deposited into the county's Maddy Emergency Medical Fund.

**Notes:** The bill was amended to remove authorization for a second \$2 assessment that would have applied to specific categories of offenses.

**Status:** Assembly Health Committee; set for hearing on June 28, 2005

**JC Position:** Oppose

**SB 395 (Escutia), as amended May 26, 2005. Court facilities bond.**

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

**Status:** Assembly Judiciary Committee ; set for hearing on July 5, 2005.

**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.

**Status:** Assembly Appropriations; held in committee. 2-year bill.

**JC Position:** Oppose

**AB 1542 (Parra), as amended May 4, 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:** Senate Appropriations Committee

**JC Position:** No position.

**AB 1551 (Runner), as amended May 18, 2005. Sexual predators.**

Strengthens the sentencing scheme for sexual assault on

*(Continued on page 4)*

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

*(Continued from page 3)*

children.

**Notes:** The Judicial Council opposed AB 1551 unless 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." The May 18 version of the bill deleted this provision, and the council has withdrawn its opposition and is now neutral on the bill.

**Sponsor:** California District Attorneys Association

**Status:** Senate Public Safety Committee; set for hearing on July 5, 2005.

**JC position:** Neutral

**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:** Enrolled.

**JC position:** Support

**SB 864 (Poochigian), as amended May 25, 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](mailto:june.clark@jud.ca.gov) or (916) 323-3121

**Status:** Assembly Public Safety Committee; set for hearing on June 28, 2005.

**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:** Senate Floor.

**JC position:** Support

**AB 1459 (Canciamilla), as amended June 21, 2005. Small claims court jurisdiction**

Among other things, increases the small claims court jurisdiction over actions brought by a natural person from \$5,000 to \$7,500. Provides that the filing fee for cases in which the jurisdictional limit is greater than \$5,000 is \$75 with \$23 of the fee to be used for enhancement of advisory services, \$2 of the fee to be used for county law libraries, and the remaining \$50 to be deposited into the Trial Court Trust Fund. Makes these filing fees inoperable upon the enactment of the Uniform Civil Fee Proposal. Effective July 1, 2006, requires temporary judges, prior to serving in small claims court, to comply with training standards set under rules adopted by the Judicial Council.

**Status:** Senate Judiciary Committee; set for hearing on June 28, 2005.

**JC position:** Support if amended.

**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-year bill.

**SB 422 (Simitian), as amended June 21, 2005. Small claims court jurisdiction**

Among other things, increases the small claims court jurisdiction over actions brought by a natural person from \$5,000 to \$7,500. Provides that the filing fee for cases in which the jurisdictional limit is greater than \$5,000 is \$75 with \$23 of the fee to be used for enhancement of advisory services, \$2 of the fee to be used for county law libraries, and the remaining \$50 to be deposited into the Trial Court Trust Fund. Makes these filing fees inoperable upon the enactment of the Uniform Civil Fee Proposal. Effective July 1, 2006, requires temporary judges, prior to serving in small claims court, to com-

*(Continued on page 5)*

## LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

(Continued from page 4)

ply with training standards set under rules adopted by the Judicial Council.

**Status:** Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**JC position:** Support if amended.

### FAMILY

**AB 104 (Cohn), as amended May 25, 2005. Protective orders: dismissal.**

Provides that a domestic violence protective order may be dismissed by the issuing judge, to the extent feasible, upon a substantial change of circumstances, and written stipulation filed with the court or on the motion of a party to terminate the order prior to its expiration date. Authorizes a protective order to be dismissed by the issuing judge if the protected person appears before the court and the court makes a finding that the protected person is acting voluntarily without coercion or duress.

**Status:** Senate Public Safety Committee; set for hearing on June 28, 2005. Senate Health Committee; set for hearing on July 6, 2005.

**JC Position:** Oppose

**AB 118 (Cohn), as amended May 25, 2005. Protective orders: minor children.**

Requires that child custody orders must reference and acknowledge the precedence of enforcement of 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:** Senate Judiciary Committee

### JUDICIAL OFFICERS

**AB 1595 (Evans), as amended May 16, 2005. 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. Provides for exceptions for health care providers and financial institutions covered under existing privacy laws.

**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."

**Sponsor:** Author

**Status:** Senate Judiciary Committee; set for hearing on

June 28, 2005.

**JC position:** Support

**SB 506 (Poochigian), as amended May 31, 2005. Voter records: confidentiality**

Allows a county elections official to, upon application of a public safety officer, to make confidential the residence information of the officer contained in the affidavit of registration, subject to certain requirements. Provides that public safety officer includes judges and court commissioners for the purposes of the bill.

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

**Sponsor:** Author

**Status:** Assembly Governmental Organization Committee; set for hearing on July 6, 2005.

**JC position:** Support

### JUVENILE DEPENDENCY

**SB 218 (Scott), as amended April 21, 2005. 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:** Passed Senate

### PROBATE

**SB 390 (Bowen), as amended June 14, 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:** Assembly Floor ■

## CONFERENCE COMMITTEE AGREES ON JUDICIAL BRANCH BUDGET

(Continued from page 1)

budget year continuation of Provision 8 funding provided to the trial courts in the current year and additional current year deficiency monies that are still pending with the Legislature.

- Restored \$55 million of annual baseline trial court funding, which had been reduced in fiscal year 2004-2005.
- Approved budget bill language that earmarks up to \$5 million for funding Self-Help Centers. (Evaluation of impact pending.)
- Approved the undesignated fees compromise negotiated between the AOC and the California State Association of Counties for the purpose of protecting the trial courts from a \$31 million reduction. (Note to presiding judges and court executives: This does not include the buy-out of AB 233 fees originally proposed.)
- Denied the Uniform Civil Fee proposal as part of the budget. The AOC will continue to advocate for the

Uniform Civil Fee proposal in separate legislation in 2005, to be implemented on January 1, 2006.) Please note that the Conference Committee did extend the court security fee surcharge so that current civil fees will remain in effect until July 1, 2006, or upon the adoption of a Uniform Civil Fee structure.

- Denied \$5.5 million restoration of one-time reductions and reduced an additional \$2.2 million from Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and the AOC. This proposed reduction of \$7.7 million would present significant challenges for the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and the AOC.

The above Conference Committee actions were included in the Conference Report that was debated in the Legislature on Wednesday, June 15. The Conference Report failed in the Assembly 45 to 32 and failed in the Senate 25 to 13.

Legislative leadership will continue to discuss the budget with the Governor in the coming days in an effort to approve a budget prior to the new fiscal year that begins on July 1, 2005. ■

## SYMPOSIUM HELD ON IMPLEMENTATION OF AB 129 (COHN)

On June 20, 2005, representatives from 27 counties convened at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) in San Francisco for the Transfer of Knowledge Symposium on Dual-Status Children. The symposium was spurred by the recent enactment of AB 129 (Cohn), Stats. 2004, ch. 468, which allows counties to adopt local protocols allowing for simultaneous dependency and delinquency jurisdiction over a child.

The symposium, organized by the AOC's Center for Families, Children and the Courts, opened with a welcome from William C. Vickrey, the Administrative Director of the Courts, and was moderated by the Hon. Dean Stout, Presiding Judge, Superior Court



Presiding Judge Stout of the Inyo County Superior Court moderates the AB 129 Symposium.

of Inyo County and a member of the Judicial Council's Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.

Symposium participants heard from panels on issues confronting California's counties, national models for dual-status children, and implementation of different dual-status models. Panelists included representatives of probation, juvenile courts, the state Department of Social Services, and the Child Welfare League of America.

Each county was represented by a team of stakeholders who will be involved in developing a dual-status protocol. Every team had a representative of their juvenile

(Continued on page 7)

## SYMPOSIUM HELD ON IMPLEMENTATION OF AB 129 (COHN)

*(Continued from page 6)*

court, probation department and child welfare agency. In addition, counties were invited to bring attorneys for children, district attorneys, and county counsel representatives.

Team meetings were scheduled between the various panels to allow for planning and discussion that was county specific, and to flag issues that could be addressed in the subsequent panels. In these sessions, the various stakeholders had an opportunity to share their perspectives and expertise, and to discuss the pros and cons of various approaches if implemented in their county.

While there was consensus on the value of coordination between child welfare and probation in order to improve outcomes for children and families, there was also a keen awareness of the need for each county to tailor its protocol to address its own needs. Judge Stout described his reasons for supporting a dual-status approach by sharing



*The El Dorado County team discusses dual-status protocols for juveniles.*

an anecdote from his days as a public defender in juvenile court. He was representing a child who was adjudicated a delinquent ward, but who had previously been a dependent child. The child's mother was present at the hearing, and as she exited the courtroom with her son, Judge Stout heard her declare to the son "I told you it was all your fault." Under Judge Stout's leadership, Inyo County has a draft protocol developed, and one of its objectives is to ensure that parents do not view their children's behavioral problems as absolving them for responsibility for their own abuse or neglect.

Because AB 129 was co-sponsored by the Judicial Council and the Children's Law Center, Los Angeles, the AOC is

committed to assisting counties in developing and implementing their protocols, and is responsible for evaluating the results in those counties that adopt protocols. The recent symposium was an important element in that effort, and will be followed with additional technical assistance as counties request it. ■

---

## LEGISLATOR PROFILE: ASSEMBLY MEMBER PEDRO NAVA

*(Continued from page 1)*

families and less time commuting. Serving on these committees will help me work toward these goals," said Assembly Member Nava.

Born in 1948, Assembly Member Nava grew up and attended public schools in Southern California. He is a strong supporter of public education. He studied at San Bernardino Community College, graduated from California State University, San Bernardino, and obtained his law degree from the University of California, Davis, Martin Luther King Jr. Hall, School of Law.

After graduation from law school, he worked in job training programs for the economically disadvantaged in Fresno. Assembly Member Nava later became a deputy district attorney in the Fresno County DA's Office, was involved in Targeted Narcotics Prosecution, headed up the county-wide Drug Crime Task Force, was a Board member of the Fresno Rape Crisis Center, and was President of the Fresno Community College President's EOP&S Advisory Committee. In 1985, he joined the

Santa Barbara District Attorney's office, where his assignments included the Consumer/Business Law Section. Since 1987, Nava has been a civil litigator, primarily representing nurses and health care practitioners.

A Santa Barbara resident, Assembly Member Nava has a long history of community involvement, having served as the president of the Board of Trustees of the Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law, president of the Santa Barbara Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, board member of the Santa Barbara Women Lawyers, trustee of the Santa Barbara Museum of Art, and a long time member of the Santa Barbara Jewish-Latino Roundtable. Nava received the first Women's Economic Ventures "Man of Equality" award in 2001.

Nava is married to Susan Jordan, co-founder of the California Coastal Protection Network (CCPN) and Vote The Coast. They have a 16-year-old son. ■



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  
Martin Riley

**Story Manager**

Christina Fonseca

**Production Staff**

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](mailto: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](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courtadmin/aoc/capconn.htm).

## LEGISLATURE SEEKS TO ENHANCE PROTECTIVE ORDER PROVISIONS

Seven bills are moving through the Legislature this year that would change statutes pertaining to various types of protective orders to enhance the protection those orders provide. The table below lists each bill and its key provisions. You can find the full text of each measure at [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov).

If enacted, these bills will impact the courts, and many will require the Judicial Council to develop new or modify existing forms. The Judicial Council has not taken a position on any of these bills, but Office of Governmental Affairs staff is working with the authors' offices to ensure that implementation will be workable for the courts. If you have questions about any of the listed bills, please contact Tracy Kenny at [tracy.kenny@jud.ca.gov](mailto:tracy.kenny@jud.ca.gov) or (916) 323-3121.

Bill	Author	Key Provisions
AB 99	Cohn	Allows the court to issue DVPA orders for up to a five-year period.
AB 112	Cohn	Provides that certain Emergency Protective Orders have enforcement priority over a domestic violence protective order issued by a criminal court.
AB 118	Cohn	Requires that visitation orders issued in cases where a criminal protective order is in place must make reference to the protective order to be valid.
AB 429	Chu	Clarifies the procedures for law enforcement to verbally serve a domestic violence or elder abuse protective order, and extends them to workplace violence protective orders.
AB 978	Runner	Requires the court to order that a restrained person be enjoined from taking any activity to obtain the address or location of a protected person when issuing a protective order for domestic violence, stalking, elder abuse, or workplace violence.
AB 1288	Chu	Requires the criminal court to consider issuing a firearms restriction order in domestic violence prosecutions where a stay-away order is not being made.
SB 720	Kuehl	Requires the court to ensure that DVPA orders filed with the court on the required Judicial Council forms are entered into CLETS by direct court entry or transmittal to a designated law enforcement agency that can enter them.

**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](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov). To subscribe to these newsletters, contact [pubinfo@jud.ca.gov](mailto: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](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/resources/publications/newsletter.htm).