

**Superior Court of California
County of Contra Costa**

**APPENDIX A:
STANDING ORDERS
Table of Contents**

SUBJECT AREA

CATEGORY #

JUDICIAL AUTHORITY..... 1

1.1	Designation of Alternate Judges to Authorize Interception of Wire Communications.	FILED 05/22/2013 AMENDED 1/3/2023
1.2	Substitution of Attorneys in Juvenile Court Dependency Cases	FILED 05/28/2015
1.3	Order Regarding Unlawful Detainer Cases	FILED 5/30/2018 AMENDED 09/02/2021
1.4	Order Directing Commissioners to Conduct Contempt Proceedings	FILED 12/13/2019
1.5	Order re: Standing Orders (Rescinding and Renumbering)	FILED 11/3/2022
1.6	Subordinate Judicial Officers	FILED 1/30/2024
1.7	Implementing CRC 10.365 re Judge Remote Appearance	FILED 7/24/2024
1.8	General Order re: Use of Electronic Recording Equipment (First Amended)	FILED 12/30/2024 AMENDED 10/2/2025

RECORDS AND RECORD ACCESS 2

2.1	Standing Order (Probate) Re: Release of Information for the Benefit of Minors.	FILED 12/12/2000
2.2	Order and Agreement Re Preservation of Court Records.	DATED 01/10/2005
2.3	Order to Purge Misdemeanor Arrest and Bench Warrants.	FILED 8/29/2024

**Superior Court of California
County of Contra Costa**

**APPENDIX A:
STANDING ORDERS
Table of Contents**

SUBJECT AREA **CATEGORY #**

2.4	Order to Recall all Outstanding Bench Warrants issued on Unsigned Citations	FILED 06/12/2012
-----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------

RECORDS AND RECORD ACCESS (cont.)..... 2

2.5	Order Re Release of Information Pertaining to Minors Described by Section 601 or 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code	FILED 07/08/2013
2.6	Courtesy Copies to DA Office for 827 File Review Requests	FILED 8/3/2015
2.7	Confidentiality of Court Records; Local Inmates and Petitions for Involuntary Psychiatric Medication	FILED 4/10/2019
2.8	PC 987 Funding Orders	FILED 12/19/2023
2.9	Electronic Access to Court Records (Second Amended)	FILED 6/11/2025

FILING AND FILING DATES 3

3.1	Facsimile Filing in Certain Juvenile Cases	FILED 10/1/2019
3.2	E-Filing in Civil Cases (Ninth Amended)	FILED 6/13/2022 AMENDED 2/2/2026
3.3	Sealing and Expungement in Criminal Cases	FILED 1/20/2023 AMENDED 12/18/25
3.4	E-Filing in Criminal and Juvenile Cases	FILED 11/16/2023
3.5	Civil Ex Partes and MSJ/MSAs	FILED 9/3/2025

**Superior Court of California
County of Contra Costa**

**APPENDIX A:
STANDING ORDERS
Table of Contents**

SUBJECT AREA

CATEGORY #

GENERAL ORDERS 4

4.1	Order Regarding Return of Dangerous, Toxic, Bio-Hazardous Materials/Exhibits	FILED 5/15/2015
4.2	Order Authorizing Children and Family Services Bureau to Regularly Photograph Dependent Children For Identification and Documentation Purposes	FILED 9/14/2015
4.3	Court Reporters in Family Law Cases	FILED 8/11/2021
4.4	Weapons Screening	FILED 3/16/2026
4.5	Cash Payments	FILED 5/15/2026
4.6	Bail Schedule	FILED 7/8/26

FILED
JAN - 3 2023

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

K. BIEKER CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
Deputy Clerk

Date: January 2, 2023
JUDGE: EDWARD G. WEIL

DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK: DIANA GHIRARDO
UNREPORTED

AMENDED STANDING ORDER RE: WIRE AUTHORIZATIONS

Pursuant to Penal Code Section 629.50, the Court hereby designates Judge John Kennedy as the judge of the Superior Court authorized to review, sign, and otherwise handle all matters pertaining to any application for an order or modification of an order authorizing the interception of a wire or electronic communication (as defined in penal Code section 629.50 *et seq.*), when such an application is presented by the Attorney General's Office or the District Attorney's Office.

Further pursuant to Section 629.50, the following additional judges are authorized to review and sign an order authorizing an interception.

1. Judge Terri Mockler
2. Judge Mary Ann O'Malley

This order supersedes any prior versions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 2, 2023



HON. EDWARD G. WEIL
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

Superior Court of the State of California
For the County of Contra Costa
Juvenile Court

FILED
MAY 28 2015
ja

By Stephen H. Nash, Deputy Clerk
K. Cardinale

STANDING ORDER #3 (2015)
Substitution of Attorneys in Juvenile Court Dependency Cases

In criminal cases, the trial court, in its discretion, may deny such a motion if discharge will result in 'significant prejudice' to the defendant, or if it is not timely, i.e., if it will result in 'disruption of the orderly processes of justice'. (*People v. Ortiz*, 51 Cal.3d 975, 983.)

This does not reflect the balance of interests in dependency cases. The focus of dependency law is "on the preservation of the family as well as the safety, protection, and physical and emotional well-being of the child." (§ 300.2. W&I Code) the children's interests are of paramount consideration. The rights and protections afforded parents in a dependency proceeding are not the same as those afforded to the accused in a criminal proceeding. (In *re James F.* (2008) 42 Cal.4th 901, 915) Pursuant to section 352, the juvenile court may for good cause order a continuance of a dependency hearing. Section 352 mandates that before the court can grant a continuance it must "give substantial weight to a minor's need for prompt resolution of his or her custody status, the need to provide children with stable environments, and the damage to a minor of prolonged temporary placements." (In *re Elizabeth R.* (1995) 35 Cal.App.4th 1774, 1798)

The juvenile court has broad discretion in determining whether to grant a continuance. (§ 352(a);

Any attorney wishing to substitute in to a juvenile dependency case must follow the below listed procedures and timelines:

- 1) If retained counsel is substituting in for appointed counsel, a motion for substitution must be filed with the Court at least two weeks before any scheduled court hearing. This motion must be served on all existing attorneys in the case. The motion will be set for a hearing promptly and normally there will be no continuance of the previously scheduled hearing as a condition of the Court granting the substitution. New counsel will be prepared to represent the client at the next scheduled hearing.
- 2) If retained counsel is substituting in for retained counsel a substitution of counsel form (MC-050) signed by new counsel, old counsel and the client may be filed in lieu of a formal motion. The form must be filed with the court and served on all counsel at least two weeks before any scheduled court hearing. Normally there will be no continuance of the previously scheduled hearing as a condition of the Court accepting the substitution. New counsel will be prepared to represent the client at the next scheduled hearing.

DATED: May 28, 2015

Thomas M. Medda
Presiding Judge Juvenile Court

FILED
DEC 16 2019

K. BIEKER CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
By  Deputy Clerk
M. M. M. M.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

In re Family Law Contempt Proceedings


**ORDER DIRECTING COMMISSIONER
TO CONDUCT CONTEMPT
PROCEEDINGS**

1. Any commissioner assigned to hear family law contempt proceedings shall conduct arraignment proceedings on an Order to Show Cause and Affidavit for Contempt, including the issuance and signing of bench warrants. (Cal. Gov. C., § 72190.1.)

2. Any commissioner assigned to hear family law contempt proceedings, and who is not acting as a temporary judge per stipulation of the parties in those proceedings, shall hear and report his or her findings and conclusions to the court on issues of fact in contempt proceedings related to support, dissolution of marriage, nullity of marriage, or legal separation. (Cal. Code of Civ. Proc., § 259, subd. (e).)

It is so ordered.

Dated: 12/13/19



Barry Baskin, Presiding Judge

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

DATE: November 3, 2022
JUDGE: REBECCA C. HARDIE

DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK:
UNREPORTED



ORDER RE: STANDING ORDERS

The Court has revised and substantially eliminated the majority of its previously-enacted standing orders. By this Order, I rescind the final few standing orders which are outdated or no longer applicable, and renumber all remaining standing orders.

Barring further order of the Presiding Judge, and to preserve the tracking and publication of all orders as required by the Rules of Court and Code of Civil Procedure section 575.1(c), standing orders must be submitted to the Presiding Judge for approval, with the advice of the Executive Committee as determined by the Presiding Judge.

The following standing orders are rescinded:

1. Standing Order 1.1
2. Standing Order 5.11
3. Standing Order 6.20

Per Code of Civil Procedure section 575.1(c), which requires orders to be numbered sequentially on a common subject, Standing Orders – including this order – shall be recategorized and renumbered as follows:

Section 1: Judicial Authority

- 1.1: Designation of Alternate Judges to Authorize Interception of Wire Communications
- 1.2: Substitution of Attorneys in Juvenile Court Dependency Cases
- 1.3: Order Regarding Unlawful Detainer Cases
- 1.4: Order Directing Commissioners to Conduct Contempt Proceedings
- 1.5: Order re Standing Orders

Section 2: Records and Records Access

- 2.1: Standing Order (Probate) Re: Release of Information for the Benefit of Minors
- 2.2: Order and Agreement re Preservation of Court Records
- 2.3: Order to Purge Misdemeanor Arrest and Bench Warrants

- 2.4: Order to Recall All Outstanding Bench Warrants Issued on Unsigned Citations
- 2.5: Order re Release of Information Pertaining to Minors Described but Section 601 or 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code
- 2.6: Courtesy Copies to DA Office for 827 File Review Requests
- 2.7: Confidentiality of Court Records; Local Inmates and Petitions for Involuntary Psychiatric Medication

Section 3: Filing and Filing Dates

- 3.1: Facsimile Filing in Certain Juvenile Cases
- 3.2 E-Filing in Civil Cases

Section 4: General Orders

- 4.1: Order Regarding Return of Dangerous, Toxic, Biohazardous Materials/Exhibits
- 4.2: Order Authorizing Children and Family Services Bureau to Regularly Photograph Dependent Children for Identification and Documentation Purposes
- 4.3: Court Reporters in Family Law Cases

Additional Standing Orders shall follow consecutively in number within categories. Categories may be added by the Presiding Judge, in consultation with the Executive Committee as determined by the Presiding Judge. Standing Orders shall be included with the regular publication of the Local Rules and posted on the Local Rules section of the Court's website.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 3, 2022



HON. REBECCA C. HARDIE
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

**Date: January 30, 2024
JUDGE: EDWARD G. WEIL**

**DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK: CAROLINE RUARO
UNREPORTED**

STANDING ORDER RE: SUBORDINATE JUDICIAL OFFICERS

For many years, the Court has benefitted from the service of subordinate judicial officers who handle specific matters on behalf of the Court, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 259, Government Code sections 71290, 71290.1, and 71622, and other applicable statutes and case law. To clarify the scope and authority of subordinate judicial officers in the Contra Costa Superior Court, **IT IS ORDERED:**

1. In the event any person is hired by the Court and takes the Oath of Office for a Commissioner of the California Superior Court (a "Commissioner"), the Presiding Judge shall issue an order of appointment which shall be entered into the minutes of the Court.
2. A Commissioner shall have authority to hear those matters described in Code of Civil Procedure section 259 and Government Code sections 72190 and 72190.1, including infraction matters, small claims matters, and arraignments, and any other matters which a subordinate judicial officer may hear pursuant to statute.
3. A Commissioner shall have authority to hear civil harassment, unlawful detainer, and civil discovery matters upon stipulation of the parties.
4. A Commissioner shall have the authority to hear Department of Child Support Services matters as provided under Family Code section 4251.
5. Prior to exercising any power to hear the above matters, a Commissioner must satisfy any qualification and/or training requirements of the Judicial Council as may be established under Government Code sections 71622(c) and (d).
6. Authority to act as a Commissioner shall expire immediately upon the Commissioner's retirement, resignation, or termination of service. The Presiding Judge shall issue an order of termination, which shall be entered into the minutes of the Court.

7. By separate order, the Presiding Judge may assign a retired Commissioner to subordinate judicial service as provided in Government Code section 71622(g).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 30, 2024



HON. EDWARD G. WEIL
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

**DATE: JULY 24, 2024
JUDGE: HON. EDWARD G. WEIL**

**DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK: CAROLINE RUARO
UNREPORTED**

STANDING ORDER 1.7 IMPLEMENTING CALIFORNIA RULE OF COURT 10.635

This Standing Order implements Rule of Court 10.635. It does not apply in criminal proceedings or other proceedings identified in Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76, which include, but are not limited to, juvenile justice proceedings and Lanterman-Petris-Short Act proceedings.

1. Presiding from Chambers or Locations in a Courthouse Other Than a Courtroom

Pursuant to CRC 10.635(d), the Presiding Judge hereby finds that it is in the interest of justice for a judicial officer to preside remotely from a location within a court facility, other than a courtroom, as long as no parties are appearing in person. Case-by-case approval by the Presiding Judge is not required. If the proceeding is one that is required by law to be open to the public, the remote access link shall be accessible to the public on a listen-only basis.

2. Presiding From a Location Outside the Courthouse

a. Pursuant to CRC 10.635(e), the Presiding judge hereby finds that it is in the interest of justice for a judicial officer to preside from a location outside a courthouse (including their residence), and that so presiding is "essential to prevent a significant delay that would substantially prejudice the litigants," where all of the following conditions exist:

- (i) The judicial officer has a medical or family emergency occurring since the original setting of the proceeding that would require the proceeding to be continued at a substantial prejudice to the parties. If the judicial officer is physically ill and/or precluded from entering the courthouse by COVID or other infectious disease protocols, they must be well enough to preside over the proceeding. This does not permit presiding from outside the courthouse in order to accommodate routine appointments or where presiding from the courtroom would merely inconvenience the judicial officer.

- (ii) The location outside the courthouse is appropriate for a court hearing, i.e., it is sufficiently quiet, the location has functioning and appropriate technology to enable the hearing to proceed with needed visual and sound quality, and anything visible in the background is appropriate for a judicial proceeding. Locations other than the judicial officer's residence, including but not limited to waiting rooms, airports, or motor vehicles, are presumptively inappropriate.
 - (iii) The location is within the State of California.
 - (iv) The judicial officer obtains approval from their supervising judge, who shall determine whether the criteria of this policy are met.
- b. The requirement of Government Code 68110 which requires that every judge "shall, in open court during the presentation of causes before him or her, wear a judicial robe," applies to remote proceedings as it would in the courthouse, i.e., if the proceeding would require a robe in the courthouse, it is required for a remote proceeding. Matters typically conducted in chambers, e.g., settlement conferences, do not require a robe. If the proceeding is being held remotely due to an emergency that prevented the judge from obtaining a robe, the judge may proceed without wearing a robe.
- c. Approval to preside from outside the courthouse pursuant to the "hazardous conditions" provision of CRC10.635(e)(1) must be obtained in each individual case by the Presiding Judge, or if unavailable, the Assistant Presiding Judge, or if unavailable, the Supervising Judge.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 24, 2024



HON. EDWARD G. WEIL
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**



**FIRST AMENDED GENERAL ORDER
RE: USE OF ELECTRONIC RECORDING
EQUIPMENT**

October 6, 2025

Just seven years ago, our Supreme Court warned that “the absence of a court reporter at trial court proceedings and the resulting lack of a verbatim record of such proceedings will frequently be fatal to a litigant’s ability to [appeal].” (*Jameson v. Desta* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 594, 608.) The Supreme Court thereby invalidated a Superior Court’s practice of requiring indigent parties to arrange and pay for a court reporter. (*Id.* at pp. 611, 623.) The *Jameson* decision was just one of many instances in which California courts have struck down or rejected laws, rules, doctrines, and policies that might “significantly chill [a] litigant’s enjoyment of the fundamental protections of the right to appeal.” (*Coleman v. Gulf Ins. Group* (1986) 41 Cal.3d 782, 797.) “The State of California is not constitutionally required to establish avenues of appellate review, ‘but it is now fundamental that, once established, these avenues must be kept free of unreasoned distinctions that can only impede open and equal access to the courts.’ [Citation.]” (*In re Arthur N.* (1974) 36 Cal.App.3d 935, 939.)

The Contra Costa Superior Court (“Court”) can no longer reliably staff its courtrooms with court-employed certified shorthand reporters (“CSRs”) because of a chronic shortage of CSRs available to be hired. Without a CSR, vast numbers of litigants are left without a verbatim transcript—or even *any* verbatim record—of what occurred in hearings that may have a profound impact on their rights and lives.

This leaves the Court little choice. To preserve the constitutional rights of litigants and to carry out the Court’s duty to process civil cases expeditiously, this First Amended General Order permits judges of the Court to authorize electronic recording (“ER”) of proceedings in which fundamental rights are at stake.

I. Like other courts across the state, the Court faces a crisis in CSR availability that has compromised its ability to provide CSRs where needed, despite its best efforts in recruitment and retention.

Under current law, the Court is obligated to provide CSRs for felonies; juvenile justice and dependency proceedings; upon request by indigent litigants with an approved fee waiver; and in certain other proceedings.¹ To provide such coverage, the Court has been forced to remove CSRs from its family law, probate, and unlimited civil departments. Where its own CSRs are not available, the Court has tried to provide CSRs on an ad hoc basis—by the hour, by the day, or for a given hearing upon special request by the judicial officer. But this stopgap measure has proven inadequate, the Court cannot guarantee the ability to maintain it going forward, and there is likewise no

¹ The facts set forth in this order are based on the Declaration of Court Executive Officer Sarah Lind.

guarantee that the available hourly or per diem court reporters will consistently fill the ever-increasing need for reporter coverage.

The shrinking of the number of CSRs available to be hired has been evident for years, drawing persistent warnings from judiciary and legislative leaders, as well as from access-to-justice non-profits and other similar organizations. Indeed, very recently, the Court received a demand from one local legal-aid nonprofit to immediately begin using electronic recording for all civil case types, based on the constitutional crisis identified in this order. This mirrors efforts similar agencies have made at the Legislature to amend section 69957. Presiding Judges and Court Executive Officers throughout the state encouraged the Legislature to take up bills to address this crisis, but those proposed – such as SB 662, introduced in 2023, which would have expanded the use of ER to other proceedings when no court reporter was available – did not advance. As a result, for those litigants who cannot obtain a CSR because of the shortage and whose cases do not qualify for ER under section 69957, even when their fundamental rights are at stake *no one* makes a verbatim record of all the proceedings.

The Court's experience with hiring and retention of CSRs has been no different. The Court currently employs 13 full-time and 6 part-time CSRs for up to 17 departments where statutory mandates require CSRs. The total number of CSRs is down from 33 full-time and 4 part-time reporters in 2019, a loss of approximately 50%. Further, the total of 17 departments excludes additional departments which, on occasion, may hear cases requiring CSRs (e.g., a civil department hearing a criminal matter, a visiting judge hearing a criminal matter). 9 of the 19 currently-employed CSRs are retirement-eligible. While the court has 11 active per diem reporters for further additional

assistance, by the very nature of their position their availability is not guaranteed.

Efforts the Court has undertaken to encourage applications and retention have not resulted in an increase in full-time CSR staff. The Court has paid retention bonuses in this fiscal year and the three previous, and will pay bonuses in future fiscal years, as follows:

- 10% of six months' salary in FY 2022-2023, ranging from \$4,794.78 through \$5,993.48 per CSR and a \$10,000 one-time retention bonus in 2022/2023;
- 5% of six months' salary in FY 2023-2024, \$2,379.39 through 2,996.74 per CSR;
- 5% of annual salary in FY 2024-2025, ranging from \$2,911.12 through \$6,113.35 per CSR;
- \$10,000 one-time retention bonus for FY 2025/2026, pro-rated for part-time unit members;
- \$5,000 longevity bonus for reporters with 15+ years of service for FY 2025/2026, pro-rated for part-time unit members;
- \$10,000 retention bonus will be paid for FY 2026/2027, pro-rated for part-time unit members; and
- \$5,000 longevity bonus for reporters with 15+ years of service for FY 2026/2027, pro-rated for part-time unit members.

The Court's staff have attended job fairs, advertised in CSR-related media, and taken out billboards and other advertising to recruit new CSRs. Additionally, beginning in FY 2025/2026 and continuing through FY 2026/2027 the Court will offer:

- Flex-Time Accrual Bank
- Finder's Fee
- Hiring Bonuses
- Tuition Reimbursement
- Training Differential

And lastly the Court has an active CSR internship program. As of the signing of this order, four interns have completed the program and two are currently going through the program. Of the four who have completed the internship, one has been hired part-time with the Court. This internship program only impacts the Court's overall shortage if applicants complete the program, become licensed, and ultimately work for the Court as opposed to another employer.

In sum, after all the efforts at recruitment and retention, the Court's current CSR staffing between 2019 and now shows a **net loss** of approximately 20 reporters. The solution to this immediate crisis cannot be found exclusively in further recruitment efforts. And the practical result of this shortage is that many hearings proceed without a CSR, and without a verbatim record. Between January 1 2023, and August 31, 2025, the Court has held approximately **93,370** hearings without a CSR in its Civil, Family, and Probate departments.

II. Permitting ER in misdemeanors, infractions, and similar cases, while denying it for felonies, juvenile proceedings, and other matters involving fundamental rights and liberty interests, violates the United States and California constitutions.

The Legislature permits courts to use ER to create a verbatim record of proceedings in misdemeanor, infraction, and limited civil cases but has prohibited ER in any other case type. (Gov. Code, § 69957.) The Court regularly uses ER recording, or transcripts obtained from those recordings, as the record for appellate review in its Appellate Division. The Court heard 77 appeals in 2023, 84 in 2024, and 86 in 2025, to date. The vast majority of these relied on ER recordings or transcripts of ER recordings without negative impact on the ability of the Division to render decisions on the appeals. Additionally, the Court has outfitted all of its courtrooms with updated electronic recording and audio technology to ensure that each department can produce usable, accurate audio recordings.

But in cases where section 69957 does not permit ER, and where no CSR is reasonably available due to the CSR shortage, litigants are unable to obtain a more reliable verbatim transcript. Instead, the statute operates to effectively deny them any verbatim transcript at all, which “will frequently be fatal to a litigant’s ability to [appeal].” (*Jameson, supra*, 5 Cal.5th at p. 608.)

There is no constitutionally sufficient justification to permit ER in the cases identified in section 69957 but not in other cases where a verbatim record would not otherwise be available without ER. Indeed, the Court of Appeal has struck down such a distinction in the past, holding that where verbatim transcription is provided to felony

defendants, “statutes, which permit the municipal court to deny defendants of misdemeanor criminal actions the availability of a phonographic reporter, or an electronic recording device, or some equivalent means of reasonably assuring an accurate verbatim account of the courtroom proceedings, fail to comport with constitutional principles of *due process* and *equal protection of the laws*.” (See *In re Armstrong* (1981) 126 Cal.App.3d 565, 572-574, original italics [finding the denial violated both the U.S. Constitution and Article 1, section 7 of the California constitution].) Permitting ER in certain proceedings but forbidding it in others, especially where those other proceedings implicate constitutionally protected fundamental rights and liberty interests of the litigants, violates the constitutions of the United States and the State of California.

This legislative discrimination is not narrowly tailored to meet a compelling state interest as required by a constitutionally mandated strict scrutiny analysis. (*In re Arthur N.* (1974) 36 Cal.App.3d 935, 939 [“In cases touching upon fundamental interests of the individual, the state bears the burden of establishing not only that it has a *compelling* interest which justifies the suspect classification, but also that the distinctions drawn by the regulation are *necessary* to further its purpose.”].) Indeed, the Court seriously doubts that there is *any* valid justification for depriving litigants of a verbatim transcript when a technological means for providing one is readily available, especially where that means is authorized and used in other case types.

III. Proceedings in which litigants cannot obtain a record implicate their fundamental rights and therefore raise constitutional concerns when a verbatim record is unavailable.

“It has long been the law that courts have inherent authority to determine whether statutes enacted by the Legislature transcend the limits imposed by either federal or state Constitutions... It is the duty of courts to maintain supremacy of the Constitution.” (*Byers v. Board of Supervisors* (1968) 262 Cal.App.2d 148, 157, citing *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch (U.S.) 137.) Accordingly, judicial officers may conclude that, on the facts of the case before them, they have a duty to not enforce statutory provisions, such as section 69957, where doing so would constitute a constitutional violation. Each of the case types to which this order applies implicates the fundamental rights of the litigants involved:

- A juvenile’s right to appeal “deeply involves the minor’s fundamental interests.” (*In re Arthur N.*, *supra*, 36 Cal.App.3d, at 939.)
- The Family Code, the Probate Code, and the Code of Civil Procedure provide separate statutory rights to appeal. (See Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §902; §904(a)(1), (10), (14). Where such appeal rights are provided, they must be kept free of unreasoned distinctions that impeded equal access to the courts. (*In re Arthur N.*, *supra*, at 939.)
- Non-criminal restraining order cases heard in both the Civil and Family Law departments can result in orders that materially impact a party’s fundamental rights, such as freedom of speech, freedom of movement, the right to possess firearms, and the right to free association.

- In matters under the Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) Act, there can be “no doubt the liberty interests at stake ... are significant.” (*Conservatorship of T.B.* (2024) 99 Cal.App.5th 1361, 1376.)
- Finally, orders to show cause for civil and family contempt for willful violation of court orders also implicate fundamental rights in that they expose individuals to criminal penalties: fines up to \$1,000 and incarceration for up to 5 days. (See Code Civ. Proc. § 1218.)

In each of these case types, where a CSR is not available, a judicial officer faces the conflict between the prohibition of ER under section 69957 and the litigant's fundamental constitutional rights to preservation of a record for appeal.

IV. Alternatives to ER are insufficient to provide the required constitutional safeguards to litigants.

At present, no reasonable alternatives other than ER exist for litigants whose matters are not reported. Those that do exist are alternatively unrealistic, constitutionally infirm, or both.

First, a litigant could try to retain a private CSR. But this is often prohibitively expensive for all but the wealthiest of litigants. Hinging the availability of a record on a litigant's relative ability to pay violates a litigant's due process and equal protection rights.

A litigant could also continue a matter until a CSR is available. But this can prejudicially delay the administration of justice, an especially dangerous problem in cases where immediate court action is essential – such as restraining orders, child custody decisions, and creation or elimination of conservatorships upon vulnerable

adults. The Court has a duty to expeditiously process its civil cases. (*Jameson, supra*, 179 Cal.App.4th 672, 684; see *Apollo v. Gyaami* (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 1468, 1487.) Continuing urgent cases when ER is available to provide a verbatim record does not satisfy that duty. And, finally, the question arises: continue to when? With an ever-decreasing availability of CSRs, there is simply no guarantee that a continuance would result in a court reporter being available for the rescheduled hearing, magnifying the due process problem of using continuances in this fashion.

Finally, litigants could attempt to use the settled statement process. (See Cal. Rules of Ct., rule 8.137.) But courts have recognized the inherent problems that exist with settled statements – problems which can become due process violations when those statements become the only available option. Not all issues are appropriate for settled statements because the parties cannot necessarily predict all issues that may arise. (See *Jameson, supra*, 5 Cal.5th at p. 622, fn. 20 [“There is, however, generally no way to determine in advance what issues may arise or whether such an issue can be raised and decided on appeal absent a verbatim record of the trial court proceedings.”].) And this presumes the parties could agree on the statement. If they do not, settling a statement then requires a post hoc reconstruction of the record based on the memories of proceedings occurring weeks or months prior, which are of ever-decreasing reliability. (See *Armstrong, supra*, 126 Cal.App.3d at p. 573.) While settled statements are useful where the parties *agree* to the *option* of their use, forcing them on parties to avoid a problem much more easily resolvable by ER is an unjustified and unnecessary invitation for infringement of a litigant’s constitutional protections.

V. Finding of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Based on the foregoing, the Court **FINDS** as follows:

1. California provides a statutory right of appeal in family law, probate, and civil proceedings.
2. Family law, probate, and civil litigants have fundamental due process interests in court proceedings involving the status of their marriage, the parentage and custody of their children, certain conservatorship and guardianship matters, their rights under restraining orders, and civil and family contempt proceedings.
3. The absence of a verbatim record will frequently be fatal to litigants' ability to appeal from adverse decisions in such proceedings.
4. The Court is unable to reliably supply a court-employed CSR to its family law, probate, or civil departments given the Court's shortage of court-employed CSRs and its legal obligation to provide court-employed CSRs in other matters.
5. The Court has undertaken reasonable steps to attempt to retain and hire more CSRs, but those attempts have been unsuccessful and are likely to remain unsuccessful. There is no basis to believe that, either in the short or long term, the Court will be able to hire sufficient CSRs to reliably staff its family law, probate, and civil departments. At present, they do not exist to be hired.
6. Government Code section 69957 permits ER for infraction, criminal misdemeanor, and limited civil matters for the purpose of creating a verbatim

record of proceedings. This is a reasonable alternative for the creation of a verbatim record of proceedings via ER technology in the absence of an available CSR.

7. The Court's Appellate Division successfully reviewed and decided appeals when ER was used to create a record of infraction, criminal misdemeanor, and limited civil matters for the purpose of creating a verbatim transcript.
8. In contrast to how it permits litigants to protect their appellate rights in infraction, criminal misdemeanor, and limited civil matters, section 69957 prohibits electronic recording of family law, probate, and civil matters, even those involving constitutionally protected fundamental rights and liberty interests.
9. Because of the shortage of court-employed CSRs and the prohibition of section 69957, between January 1, 2023, and August 31, 2025, the Court has held approximately **93,370** hearings in its Civil, Family, and Probate departments., for which no verbatim record of proceedings could be made. More such hearings will likewise occur each year. As a result, the court reporter shortage has become an emergency and a crisis in appellate and, ultimately, constitutional rights.
10. Attempts to persuade the California Legislature to amend the law to ameliorate this crisis have proven unsuccessful.
11. As matters stand, when judicial officers of the Court enforce section 69957—such that there is no transcript available to vast numbers of family law, probate, and civil litigants when a court employed CSR is not available for

assignment to a family law, probate, and civil departments in matters implicating constitutionally protected rights and liberty interests—they do so even though ER technology is in place which could create a verbatim record.

12. The distinction section 69957 draws among classes of litigants can result in family law, probate, and civil litigants suffering actual and serious constitutional harms on account of this legislative discrimination. This discrimination is not narrowly tailored to meet a compelling government interest, as would be required under the strict scrutiny analysis applicable to regulations which implicate the fundamental constitutional rights of litigants to due process and equal protection. There is no compelling government interest in permitting electronic recording for certain cases but not for others, especially when the class of cases where recording is not permitted implicate fundamental rights and interests. Nor is section 69957 narrowly tailored, because it forbids recording in classes of cases even where a CSR is unavailable; minimally, it could allow for electronic recording in those circumstances.
13. Instead of needlessly restricting the appellate rights of litigants in matters touching upon fundamental constitutional rights and liberty interests, the Court has a reasonable alternative method of to create a verbatim transcript of proceedings via electronic recording technology. In the absence of a reasonably available CSR which will ameliorate or eliminate the constitutional violations, the judges of the Court should have the option to preserve and protect constitutional rights rather than limit and impinge upon them.

VI. Order

Accordingly, the Presiding Judge hereby **ORDERS** the Clerk of Court to direct Deputy Clerks to operate the electronic recording equipment in family law, probate and civil departments as directed by the judicial officer presiding in such department when that judicial officer finds that: (1) the proceeding concerns matters that implicate fundamental rights or liberty rights as described herein; (2) one or more parties wishes to have the possibility of creating a verbatim transcript of the proceedings; (3) no official court-employed CSR is reasonably available to report the proceeding; (4) the party so requesting has been unable to secure the presence of a private CSR to report the proceeding because such CSR was not reasonably available or on account of that party's reasonable inability to pay; (5) the proceeding involves significant legal and/or factual issues such that a verbatim record is likely necessary to create a record of sufficient completeness; and (6) the proceeding should not, in the interests of justice, be further delayed.

This order **shall not** apply to any proceeding where electronic recording is permitted by statute.

This Order shall be effective October 6, 2025, and will remain in effect until otherwise ordered by the Presiding Judge.

Dated: October 2, 2025



HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

**DECLARATION OF COURT EXECUTIVE
OFFICER SARAH LIND**

I, Sarah Lind, declare:

1. I am the Executive Officer, Clerk of Court, and Jury Commissioner for the Contra Costa Superior Court (the Court). I have held this position since July 7, 2025. I have personal knowledge of the facts contained in this declaration and would testify to them if called upon to do so.

2. Prior to joining the Contra Costa Superior Court, I served as Deputy Court Executive Officer of the San Mateo Superior Court, and have also served as Director of Court Services for the Santa Clara Superior Court and as a Court Services Manager for the San Mateo Superior Court.

3. The Court is one of 58 superior courts in California. Its 38 judges and 4 commissioners operate in 6 courthouses supported by over 300 full-time employees. The Court's judicial officers hear every type of case under California law – criminal, civil, family law, juvenile dependency and justice, probate, and mental health.

Declaration of Executive Officer Sarah Lind

4. The Court can no longer continuously and reliably support its trial departments with court-employed certified shorthand reporters (“CSRs”) due to a chronic shortage in CSRs to be hired. For several years, I and other executive officers throughout the state, as well as presiding judges and other judicial leaders, have spoken about the ever-decreasing pool of CSRs available and the oncoming crisis it represented. Numerous court executive officers also released a statement on November 2, 2022, identifying the facts supporting the existence of the CSR shortage, describing why such a shortage would not be solved simply with more funding, and identifying the problems occasioned by the limitations on electronic recording set forth in Government Code section 66959. A copy of this statement, which was signed by former Contra Costa Superior Court Executive Office Kate Bieker, is attached as

Exhibit A.

5. Under current law, the Court is obligated to provide CSRs for felonies; juvenile justice and dependency proceedings; upon request by indigent litigants with an approved fee waiver (see *Jameson v. Desta* (2018) 5 Cal.5th 594, 599); and in certain other proceedings. To provide such coverage, the Court has been forced to remove CSRs from its family law, probate, and unlimited civil departments. Where its own CSRs are not available, the Court has tried to provide CSRs on an ad hoc basis—by the hour, by the day, or for a given hearing upon special request by the judicial officer.

6. Others have recognized the ongoing crisis as well. The Court recently received a demand from one local legal-aid nonprofit to immediately begin using electronic recording for all civil case types. This mirrors efforts similar agencies have made at the Legislature to amend section 69957. Presiding Judges and Court

Executive Officers throughout the state encouraged the Legislature to take up bills to address this crisis, but those proposed – such as SB 662, introduced in 2023, which would have expanded the use of ER to other proceedings when no court reporter was available – did not advance. As a result, for those litigants who cannot obtain a CSR because of the shortage, and whose cases do not qualify for ER under section 69957, *no one* makes a verbatim record of the proceedings even when their fundamental rights are at stake.

7. In my role as Executive Officer, I directly supervise the Deputy Executive Officer who oversees the manager of the Court's CSRs. The Court currently employs 13 full-time and 6 part-time CSRs for up to 17 departments where statutory mandates require CSRs. The total number of CSRs is down from 33 full-time and 4 part-time reporters in 2019, a loss of approximately 50%.

8. Further, the total of 17 departments excludes additional departments which, on occasion, may hear cases requiring CSRs (e.g., a civil department hearing a criminal matter, a visiting judge hearing a criminal matter). While the Court has 11 active per diem reporters for further additional assistance, by the very nature of their position their availability is not guaranteed.

9. Also, in my role as Executive Officer, I supervise the Court's Human Resources Department. Of the 19 currently employed CSRs, 9 are retirement eligible. Efforts the Court has undertaken to encourage applications and retention have not resulted in a significant increase in CSR staff. The Court has paid retention bonuses in this fiscal year and the three previous, and will pay bonuses in future fiscal years, as follows:

- 10% of six months' salary in FY 2022-2023, ranging from \$4,794.78 through \$5,993.48 per CSR; \$10,000 one-time retention bonus in 2022/2023.
- 5% of six months' salary in FY 2023-2024, \$2,379.39 through \$2,996.74 per CSR; and
- 5% of annual salary in FY 2024-2025, ranging from \$2,911.12 through \$6,113.35 per CSR.
- \$10,000 one-time retention bonus for FY 2025/2026, pro-rated for part-time unit members.
- \$5,000 longevity bonus for reporters with 15+ years of service for FY 2025/2026, pro-rated for part-time unit members.
- \$10,000 retention bonus will be paid for FY 2026/2027, pro-rated for part-time unit members.
- \$5,000 longevity bonus for reporters with 15+ years of service for FY 2026/2027, pro-rated for part-time unit members.

10. To encourage new applications, the Court's Human Resources staff significantly increased its advertising and recruitment efforts. Staff have attended job fairs, advertised in CSR-related media, and taken out billboards and other advertising to recruit new CSRs. The Court also has an active CSR internship program. Four (4) interns have completed the program and 2 are currently going through the program. Of the 4 who have completed the internship, 1 has been hired part-time with the Court. This internship program only impacts the Court's overall shortage if applicants complete the program, become licensed, and ultimately work for the Court as opposed to another

employer.

11. The CSR shortage has resulted in a substantial number of cases proceeding without verbatim records. Between January 1, 2023, and September 15, 2025, the Court has held **93,370** hearings without a CSR in its Civil, Family, and Probate departments.

12. Consistent with the commitment of our Court, its judges and staff, and the judicial system in California generally, to uphold equal access to the courts, and to support and defend both the United States and California Constitutions, I am obligated to provide sufficient CSR staffing to permit judicial officers to carry out their duties. Due to the crisis in CSR availability, I am unable to provide sufficient CSRs on a regular basis to ensure a verbatim record is captured in court proceedings.

13. In my role as Clerk of Court, I supervise the manager of the civil clerk's office and the manager supporting our Appellate Division. The Court regularly uses electronic recording ("ER"), or transcripts obtained from those recordings, as the record for appellate review in its Appellate Division. The Court heard 77 appeals in 2023, 84 in 2024, and 86 to-date in 2025. The vast majority of these relied on ER recordings or transcripts of ER recordings without negative impact on the ability of the Division to render decisions on the appeals.

14. The Court has outfitted its courtrooms with updated electronic recording and audio technology to ensure that each department can produce usable, accurate audio recordings. The Court made specific upgrades in 27 courtrooms which included: 1) upgraded recording systems to ensure quality of ER; 2) upgraded speaker and microphone systems throughout the courtrooms; 3) installation of 65"/85" smart displays

in each courtroom; 4) installation of display screens on counsel tables and witness stands; and 5) evidence presentation devices to display on the smart screens from counsel table.

15. The Court has successfully used electronic recording for appellate review in its appellate division and regularly in those cases where it is permitted under Government Code section 66957. Based on this, it is my opinion that electronic recordings and transcripts derived from such recordings allow for appellate review of a verbatim record.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that is declaration is executed this 2nd day of October, 2025.



SARAH LIND
Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
Superior Court of California
County of Contra Costa

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

November 2, 2022



SUPERIOR COURTS OF CALIFORNIA

THERE IS A COURT REPORTER SHORTAGE CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA


Each day across California, tens of thousands of court hearings are held. Lawyers argue, witnesses testify, litigants tell their stories and judges make decisions. What many people do not appreciate is the crucial role played by a court reporter: creating and preserving a verbatim record of those exchanges. As a chronic shortage of court reporters reaches crisis levels, the statutory framework for court reporting must adjust to the new realities of the reporting profession.

THE PROBLEM: There is a court reporter shortage in California – and across the nation – that has been long developing.

- In 2005, the Judicial Council warned that, “since the early 1990’s, California’s courts have experienced a steady decline in the number of available qualified shorthand reporters. [...] Additionally, the reduction of court reporting schools and curriculums in California over recent years complicates the courts’ ability to attract sufficient numbers of well-trained reporters. [2005, Reporting of the Record Task Force, *Final Report*, p. 6.]
- Nationally, a 2013 study by the National Court Reporters Association projected that “Decreased enrollment and graduation rates for court reporters, combined with significant retirement rates, will create by 2018 a critical shortfall projected to represent nearly 5,500 court reporting positions.” [Ducker Worldwide, *2013-2014: Court Reporting Industry Outlook Report, Executive Summary*, p. 5.]
- In 2017, the Chief Justice’s *Futures Commission Final Report* warned, “National data show the number of skilled court reporters is decreasing. Certified court reporting schools have experienced smaller enrollment and graduation rates, which are declining by an annual average of 7.3 percent[...].” [*Report to the Chief Justice: Commission on the Future of California’s Court System*, p. 240.]
- In 2018, the Judicial Council wrote to the Legislature that, “the state would [...] have a gap of approximately 2,750 court reporters by 2023 if forecasted

demand remains constant.” [March 29, 2018, letter from the Judicial Council to Hon. Lorena Gonzalez-Fletcher, Chair Assembly Appropriations Committee, re: Assembly Bill 2354.]

Today in California, only nine Certified Shorthand Reporter programs remain. In 2021, only 175 examinees took the licensing exam – and only 36 passed.



The result is a crisis in court reporter availability that has been developing for years.

THE SHORTAGE OF COURT REPORTERS IMPACTS LITIGANTS ACROSS CALIFORNIA:

In accordance with Penal Code § 190.9 and § 869, Code of Civil Procedure § 269 and Welfare and Institution Code § 347 and § 677, California courts must provide court reporters in felony criminal and dependency and delinquency juvenile courtrooms. Court reporters are not statutorily required to be provided by the courts in civil, family law, probate, misdemeanor criminal and traffic courtrooms.

And yet, many California courts do not have enough court reporters to cover mandated criminal felony matters – let alone the wide range of areas in which litigants need a record of court proceedings.

Over 50% of the California courts have reported that they are unable to routinely cover non-mandated case types including civil, family law and probate.

FUNDING IS NOT THE SOLUTION: There is no one to hire.

The Legislature provides \$30 million annually to the California courts to hire additional court reporters, with a focus on family law and civil courtrooms. However, because of the decline in court reporters, the crisis continues.

Today 71 percent of the state's 58 trial courts are actively recruiting for court reporters: Alameda; Butte; Contra Costa; Del Norte; El Dorado; Fresno; Humboldt; Imperial; Kern; Lake; Los Angeles; Madera; Marin; Merced; Monterey; Nevada; Orange; Placer; Riverside; Sacramento; San Benito; San Bernardino; San Diego; San Francisco, San Joaquin; San Luis Obispo; San Mateo; Santa Barbara; Santa Clara; Santa Cruz; Shasta; Siskiyou; Solano; Sonoma; Stanislaus; Tehama; Tulare; Tuolumne; Ventura; Yolo; and Yuba.

THE CURRENT STATUTORY FRAMEWORK INHIBITS CREATIVE RESPONSES TO THE SHORTAGE OF COURT REPORTERS:

With the exception of limited civil, misdemeanor and infraction cases, Government Code § 69957 prohibits the courts from providing electronic recording in civil, family law and probate courtrooms.

Government Code § 69959 and Code of Civil Procedure § 367.75(d)(2)(A) mandate court reporters to be present in the courtrooms – rather than taking advantage of emerging technologies that would allow the court to provide this service remotely to multiple courtrooms throughout the county, providing more services with existing resources while making the profession more attractive to young, potential court reporters.

Government Code § 69942 requires all court reporters who work in a court to be certified in California which restricts courts from hiring out-of-state independent firms to provide this service.

CONCLUSION: More funding is not the solution.

We stand with our court reporters in recognizing and appreciating their value and service to the California judicial branch but we must acknowledge that we are facing a California – and national – court reporter shortage.

This shortage will not be solved by increased funding. Without changes to the current statutory framework for court reporting, all courts will face the inevitable day, already seen by a few California courts, of not having enough court reporters to cover the mandated felony criminal and juvenile dependency and delinquency cases.

Every litigant in California should have access to the record. Ideally, this would be provided by a court reporter but when none are available, other options need to be available to the courts. We are ready, able and willing to work with all stakeholders on finding ways to ensure that all litigants who need a record have access to one.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES:

- U.S. Legal Support, *Understanding the National Court Reporter Shortage and What it Means for Your Firm*, [<https://www.uslegalsupport.com/court-reporting/understanding-the-national-court-reporter-shortage-and-what-it-means-for-your-firm/>]
- Ducker Worldwide, *Court Reporting Industry Outlook Report (2013 – 2014)* [[https://www.ncra.org/docs/default-source/uploadedfiles/education/schools/2013-14_ncra_industry_outlook-\(ducker\)8ef018c4b8ea486e9f8638864df79109.pdf?sfvrsn=c7a531e2_0](https://www.ncra.org/docs/default-source/uploadedfiles/education/schools/2013-14_ncra_industry_outlook-(ducker)8ef018c4b8ea486e9f8638864df79109.pdf?sfvrsn=c7a531e2_0)]
- Commission on the Future of California’s Court System, *Report to the Chief Justice*, 2017, [<https://www.courts.ca.gov/documents/futures-commission-final-report.pdf>]
- California Trial Court Consortium, *The Causes, Consequences, and Outlook of the Court Reporter Shortage in California and Beyond, 2022*, [<https://www.siskiyou.courts.ca.gov/system/files?file=court-reporter-shortage-1-2022.pdf>]

###

CEO Chad Finke
Alameda County Superior Court

CEO Ann Greth
Alpine County Superior Court

CEO Sharif Elmallah
Butte County Superior Court

CEO Erika F. Valencia
Colusa County Superior Court

CEO Kate Bieker
Contra Costa County Superior Court

CEO Esperanza Esparza
Del Norte County Superior Court

CEO Michael L. Elliott
Fresno County Superior Court

CEO Diana Baca
Glenn County Superior Court

CEO Jake Chatters
Placer County Superior Court

CEO W. Samuel Hamrick, Jr.
Riverside County Superior Court

CEO Lee Seale
Sacramento County Superior Court

CEO Tarry Singh
San Benito County Superior Court

Interim CEO Carmen Trutanich
San Bernardino County Superior Court

CEO Michael M. Roddy
San Diego County Superior Court

Interim CEO Mark Culkins
San Francisco County Superior Court

CEO Brandon E. Riley
San Joaquin County Superior Court

COURT REPORTER SHORTAGE CRISIS

November 2, 2022

Page 5 of 6

CEO Kim M. Bartleson
Humboldt County Superior Court

CEO Maria Rhinehart
Imperial County Superior Court

CEO Pam Foster
Inyo County Superior Court

CEO Tamarah Harber-Pickens
Kern County Superior Court

CEO Nocona Soboleski
Kings County Superior Court

CEO Krista LeVier
Lake County Superior Court

CEO Teresa Stalter
Lassen County Superior Court

CEO Sherri R. Carter
Los Angeles County Superior Court

CEO Adrienne Calip
Madera County Superior Court

CEO James Kim
Marin County Superior Court

CEO Desiré Leard
Mariposa County Superior Court

CEO Kim Turner
Mendocino County Superior Court

CEO Amanda Toste
Merced County Superior Court

CEO Brandy Malcolm
Modoc County Superior Court

CEO Lester Perpall
Mono County Superior Court

CEO Chris Ruhl
Monterey County Superior Court

CEO Michael Powell
San Luis Obispo County Superior Court

CEO Neal Taniguchi
San Mateo County Superior Court

CEO Darrel Parker
Santa Barbara County Superior Court

CEO Rebecca Fleming
Santa Clara County Superior Court

CEO Alex Calvo
Santa Cruz County Superior Court

CEO Melissa Fowler-Bradley
Shasta County Superior Court

CEO Ann Mendez
Sierra County Superior Court

CEO René McCanna Crane
Siskiyou County Superior Court

CEO Brian K. Taylor
Solano County Superior Court

CEO Robert M. Oliver
Sonoma County Superior Court

CEO Hugh K. Swift
Stanislaus County Superior Court

CEO Stephanie M. Hansel
Sutter County Superior Court

CEO Kevin Harrigan
Tehama County Superior Court

CEO Staci Holliday
Trinity County Superior Court

CEO Stephanie Cameron
Tulare County Superior Court

CEO Hector Gonzalez, Jr.
Tuolumne County Superior Court

COURT REPORTER SHORTAGE CRISIS

November 2, 2022

Page 6 of 6

CEO Bob Fleshman
Napa County Superior Court

CEO Jason B. Galkin
Nevada County Superior Court

CEO David H. Yamasaki
Orange County Superior Court

CEO Brenda L. McCormick
Ventura County Superior Court

CEO Shawn Landry
Yolo County Superior Court

CEO Heather Pugh
Yuba County Superior Court

FILED

2000 DEC 12 A 8:27

K. JONES, CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
D. B. BARNHART, Deputy Clerk

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

In re: release of information for the benefit
of minors.


STANDING ORDER
(PROBATE)

_____ /

In most jurisdictions there is a child protective services agency, or similar agency, which has the authority and obligation to protect minors from neglect and abuse. Law enforcement agencies also have responsibility for this protection. In many cases, these agencies will be involved with children who are the subject of guardianship proceedings pending in this Court's Probate Department. . The purpose of guardianship proceedings is to protect minors, and that protection is best served by cooperation with these agencies, including exchange of relevant information. Accordingly, GOOD CAUSE APPEARING,

THERE IS HEREBY ISSUED A STANDING ORDER that the court's investigators are authorized to release to law enforcement, child protective services or similar agencies, upon request or where it appears to the investigators that this would be in the minor's best interest, any reports and other information in possession of the court's investigators.

Dated: October 17, 2000



Judge of the Superior Court

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

Miscellaneous Filing

ORDER AND AGREEMENT
RE PRESERVATION OF
COURT RECORDS

Pursuant to the mandate of California Rule of Court 6.755, the Court hereby designates the Contra Costa County Historical Society as the archival facility to preserve and catalogue court records in accordance with subsection (i). The Historical Society agrees to comply with the storage, access and other applicable requirements of Rule 6.755, and to report to the Court as requested regarding the status of court records at its archival facility.

Dated: January 10, 2005



THOMAS M. MADDOCK PRESIDING JUDGE
Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa

The Contra Costa County Historical Society agrees to the terms above and agrees to archive the records listed in Attachment A, incorporated herein by this reference.

Dated: January 12, 2005



BETTY MAFEL, DIRECTOR
On behalf of The Contra Costa County Historical Society

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Miscellaneous Filing

ATTACHMENT A TO ORDER
AND AGREEMENT RE
PRESERVATION OF COURT
RECORDS

Pursuant to the mandate of California Rule of Court 6.755, the Court hereby designates the Contra Costa County Historical Society as the archival facility to preserve and catalogue the following court records in accordance with subsection (l).

- Registers of Actions (Civil & Family Law) vol. 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263.
- Registers of Actions (Richmond Court - Civil, Family Law, Probate) vol. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, vol. 1, 2, 4, 5.
- Registers of Actions (Criminal) vol. 3, 4, 5, 6, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32.
- Registers of Actions (Probate) vol. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75.
- Judgment Books (Civil, Family Law) vol. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109.
- Judgment Dockets vol. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 (A-M), 10 (N-Z).
- Decrees of Distribution (Probate) vol. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.
- Naturalization Records (Petitions, Declarations of Intention, Depositions) (1850 - 1879) - 1 box
- Naturalization Records (Index Cards, Certificate Stubs) - 3 boxes
- Probate Vouchers (1950's and 1960's) - 13 boxes

ATTACHMENT A TO ORDER
AND AGREEMENT RE
PRESERVATION OF COURT
RECORDS

Pursuant to the mandate of California Rule of Court 6.755, the Court hereby designates the Contra Costa County Historical Society as the archival facility to preserve and catalogue the following court records in accordance with subsection (i).

- Index to Probate Records Volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 (1946 – 1974)
- General Civil Index Plaintiffs Volume 6 (A-K) (1924 – 1938)
- Volume 6 (L-Z) (1924 – 1938)
- Volume 7 (E-K) (1938 – 1956)
- Volume 7 (S-Z) (1938 – 1955)
- General Civil Index Defendants Volume 6 (A-K) (1924 – 1938)
- Volume 6 (L-Z) (1924 – 1938)
- Volume 7 (A-D) (1938 – 1956)
- Volume 7 (S-L) (1938 – 1956)
- Register of Action – Criminal Volumes 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
(1943 – 1968)
- People vs. Marshall Martin & Elizabeth Eichler - Court documents, transcripts, court reporter notes, sheriff's bills - 1873

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

DATE: AUGUST 29, 2024
JUDGE: HON. EDWARD G. WEIL

DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK: CAROLINE RUARO
UNREPORTED

STANDING ORDER 2.3
RE: PURGING MISDEMEANOR ARREST AND BENCH WARRANTS

This order sets the Court's uniform policy to establish purge criteria for misdemeanor and infraction warrants.


<p>Purge 3 years from warrant issue date</p>	<p>All CVC misdemeanors and infractions except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CVC 23103a & b • CVC 23152a & b • CVC 23153a & b <p>All other misdemeanors All AMORS cases All city & county ordinance misdemeanor and infractions</p>
<p>Purge 10 years from warrant issue date</p>	<p>Child Molestation Violations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC 647(a) • PC 647(i) <p>Child Abuse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC 273a(a) • PC 273a(b) <p>Domestic Violence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC 166(c)(1) • PC 243(e)(1) • PC 273.5(a) • PC 273.6 • PC 314 <p>Elder Abuse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC 237(b) • PC 368 <p>Sexual Abuse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC 243.4 • PC 288 (all subsections) • PC 289(c) • PC 289(h)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PC 290• PC 647.6 Other <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CVC 23103a & b• CVC 23152a & b• CVC 23153a & b
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The Judges do not wish to distinguish between bench and arrest warrant cases, the reason for the warrant, or the bail amount in question.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 29, 2024



HON. EDWARD G. WEIL
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

FILED

JUN 12 2012

K. TORRE CLERK OF THE COURT
 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA - MARTINEZ
 By [Signature]
 DEPUTY CLERK



**ORDER TO RECALL ALL
 OUTSTANDING BENCH
 WARRANTS ISSUED ON
 UNSIGNED CITATIONS**

IT IS HERBY ORDERED that all outstanding warrants that have been issued by the Superior Court of California in and for the County of Contra Costa based on the failure to appear of a defendant pursuant to an unsigned citation shall be immediately recalled. Any such citation for violations of the Vehicle Code shall be referred to the District Attorney's Office for a verified complaint filing decision pursuant to Vehicle Code section 40002. If no complaint is filed, the matter is to be dismissed. No new warrants shall issue for failure to appear on an unsigned citation.

Any unsigned citations for Non-Vehicle Code violations are to be returned to the filing law enforcement agency with instructions to submit to the District Attorney's Office for a filing decision. If no complaint is filed the matter is to be dismissed.

6/12/12
 Date

[Signature]
 Hon. John Kennedy, Acting Presiding Judge

- cc: 1) Diana Becton, Presiding Judge
 2) Supervising Judges of Traffic Courts
 3) Kiri Tore, CEO

FILED
JUL 08 2013
K. TORRE CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
By: *[Signature]*
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
IN SESSION AS A JUVENILE COURT

IN RE RELEASE OF INFORMATION)
PERTAINING TO MINORS DESCRIBED)
BY SECTION 601 OR 602 OF THE)
WELFARE AND INSTITUTIONS CODE)
_____)

BY ORDER OF THE COURT

TO THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY AND ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CONTRA COSTA COUNTY:

All school officials in all school districts in Contra Costa County may release to any probation officer of Contra Costa County who is involved in any investigation of, or ongoing supervision of, any juvenile who comes within the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court, may disclose any and all records and reports, any portion of those records and reports, and any information related to the contents of those records or reports when ward of the Court, or to provide ongoing supervision of that minor to monitor his or her compliance with any orders given to that minor by the Juvenile Court.

All information which identifies individuals in the documents of the above-mentioned agencies will be held in the strictest confidence and used for the sole purpose of informing investigations or supervision pertaining to wardship. Any use of such information for purposes other than the official disposition of the case will constitute a willful violation of the confidentiality provisions of the Juvenile Court Law. The information disclosed shall be maintained in a secure place to guard against any violation of the confidentiality provisions of the Juvenile Court Law, which is punishable as a misdemeanor.

Dated: July 8, 2013

[Signature]
LOIS HAIGHT
PRESIDING JUVENILE COURT JUDGE



Superior Court of the State of California
For the County of Contra Costa
Juvenile Court

FILED
AUG - 3 2015

STANDING ORDER #4 (2015)
Courtesy Copies to DA Office for 827 File Review Requests

STEPHEN H. NASH CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
By K. Cardinale, Deputy Clerk

In the event an attorney or other person files a petition to review or copy portions of a Juvenile file under Section 827 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, the Reviewing Judge generally provides a courtesy copy of the released pages to the District Attorney's Office. When this occurs, the copy to the DA can and will be delivered by inter-office mail. These documents are not notices or filed papers and, therefore, do not require service in accordance with CCP §1013a. The District Attorney's Office has agreed to this method of delivery and effective immediately, this method will be used by the Court.

DATED: July 28, 2015

Thomas M. Maddock
THOMAS M. MADDOCK
Presiding Judge Juvenile Court

FILED
APR 10 2019

K. BIEKER CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

By: L. Humiston, Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

In Re: CONFIDENTIALITY OF
COURT RECORDS; LOCAL
INMATES AND PETITIONS
FOR INVOLUNTARY
PSYCHIATRIC MEDICATION

STANDING ORDER - DEPARTMENT 13

Whereas petitions seeking involuntary medication of detainees pursuant to Penal Code §§ 1370(a)(2)(D)(ii), 2603(c), or 2603(d) and documents filed in support of or in opposition to such petitions contain extremely sensitive and personal information; and

Whereas detainees have an overriding privacy interest in information concerning their mental health and that interest overcomes the right of public access to the record.

Therefore, to facilitate the filing of petitions seeking involuntary medication and documents supporting or opposing such petitions while ensuring the confidentiality of those petitions and related documents, the Court hereby orders that all petitions and related documents filed pursuant to Penal Code §§ 1370(a)(2)(D)(ii), 2603(c), or 2603(d) may be filed under seal and in an envelope marked "Confidential."

//

//

1 The Court further Orders that its records relating to these petitions shall be kept in a
2 confidential file not accessible to the general public.

3
4 **APR 08 2019**

5 Dated: _____

6 
7 _____
8 Hon. Lewis A. Davis
9 Judge of the Superior Court
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

**Date: December 19, 2023
JUDGE: EDWARD G. WEIL**


**DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK: DIANA GHIRARDO
UNREPORTED**

STANDING ORDER RE: PC 987 FUNDING ORDERS

The Court authorizes the manager of the Martinez Criminal Clerks office to Open, Scan into Odyssey and Destroy any sealed envelopes containing PC 987 Funding Orders being held in the Martinez Criminal Clerks office. Any such documents shall be coded as "Sealed," i.e., access shall be limited to Judges and Managers.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 19, 2023



HON. EDWARD G. WEIL
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

DATE: JUNE 11, 2025

DEPARTMENT 1

JUDGE: HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN

COURT CLERK: CAROLINE RUARO

UNREPORTED

SECOND AMENDED STANDING ORDER 2.9
ACCESS TO ELECTRONIC COURT RECORDS
(CARE COURT AND MENTAL HEALTH)

Under California Rule of Court 2.540, the Court may grant remote access to electronic court records to certain named government entities. Subdivision (b)(1)(Q) allows the Court, for good cause, to grant remote electronic access in particular case types to government entities beyond those specifically listed. "Good cause" means that the government entity requires access to the electronic records to adequately perform its legal duties or fulfill its responsibilities in litigation.

Beginning December 2, 2024, under the Community Assistance, Recovery, and Empowerment (CARE) Act, the Court established its CARE Court. The CARE Court process directly involves Contra Costa Behavioral Health Services ("Behavioral Health"), the Office of the Public Defender, and the Office of County Counsel, all government entities, in the provision of CARE Court services. Remote electronic access to records in mental health cases allows each of these parties to adequately perform their duties in these cases.

In addition, the District Attorney's Office, the Office of the Public Defender, and the Probation Department, all governmental entities, are likewise directly involved in the representation of parties or in the administration related to mental health cases before the Court. Remote electronic access to records in mental health cases allows each of these parties to adequately perform their duties in these cases.

For this reason, the Court finds that good cause exists for each office to be **GRANTED** the specified remote access to electronic records below, subject to the conditions of this Order:

- Behavioral Health: Once Behavioral Health is ordered by the CARE Court to evaluate an individual for potential CARE Court services, Behavioral Health shall have remote access to electronic records in that individual CARE Court case only.
- Office of the Public Defender: This office shall have access to CARE Court cases and mental health cases.
- Office of the District Attorney: This office shall have access to mental health cases.

- Office of County Counsel: This office shall have access to CARE Court cases.
- Probation Department: This office shall have access to CARE Court cases and mental health cases.
- Conflicts Program: This office shall have access to mental health cases.

Such access shall be subject to Rule of Court 2.540(c) and any Memorandum of Understanding or similar document required by the Court Executive Officer to enable access. Where not specifically addressed above, the Court may restrict access only to those attorneys or other representatives of any of the above offices who are directly involved in specific cases, as determined by the Court Executive Officer in consultation with the Presiding Judge.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 11, 2025




HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

FILED
OCT 01 2019

DATE: September 30, 2019
JUDGE: BARRY BASKIN

DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK: JANE WATERS
UNREPORTED

K. BIEKER CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
By:  Deputy Clerk

STANDING ORDER RE FACSIMILE FILING IN CERTAIN JUVENILE CASES

Under Rule 5.522 of the California Rules of Court, a court that accepts facsimile filings has discretion to accept facsimile filing of petitions in juvenile cases under various Welfare and Institutions Code sections, including sections 300, 601 and 602. This Court's local rules permit facsimile filing generally and specifically in juvenile dependency proceedings. (See Local Rules 2.80 *et seq.*)

Accordingly, while a Standing Order is not necessary to address this issue in light of the discretion conferred under the Rules of Court and this Court's acceptance of facsimile filing, **IT IS ORDERED** that the Court shall accept facsimile filing of juvenile petitions under Welfare and Institutions Code sections 600 and 601. Such filings shall include Judicial Council Form JV-520 – Fax Filing Cover Sheet (Juvenile). Further, any such petitions filed by facsimile in 2017 or 2018 are deemed filed under the California Rules of Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 10/1/19



BARRY BASKIN
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

**NINTH AMENDED STANDING ORDER
RE: E-FILING IN CIVIL CASES**

February 2, 2026

Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(d) and Rules 2.252 and 2.253 of the California Rules of Court, the Court adopted Local Rule 2.87 regarding mandatory electronic filing and service in Designated Cases in January of 2022.

Further to that Local Rule, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

1. **Electronic filing in Designated Cases will be mandatory beginning on July 5, 2022**, and shall be available optionally beginning on June 20, 2022.
2. The following are Designated Cases for electronic filing:
 - a. Limited and Unlimited Civil cases, including Complex matters.
 - b. Family Law, including DCSS matters.
 - c. Probate.
 - d. Small Claims.
 - e. Unlawful Detainer.
 - f. Appeals.

3. The following documents may not be electronically filed and must still be filed/lodged in hard copy form unless otherwise ordered by the Presiding Judge or provided in an amended Local Rule:
- a. Documents related to Civil Harassment Restraining Orders and Workplace Violence Restraining Orders.
 - b. Bonds and undertakings.
 - c. Bench warrants.
 - d. Petitions for Name Change.
 - e. Challenges under Code of Civil Procedure §§ 170.1/170.3 and 170.6, except in Domestic Violence Restraining Order cases.
 - f. In Civil matters:
 - i. Subpoenas.
 - ii. Administrative Records. (Administrative records should be submitted on a flash drive, or by hard copy if ordered by the Court.)
 - g. In Civil Complex matters:
 - i. Subpoenas.
 - ii. Administrative Records.
 - h. In Probate matters:
 - i. Ex Parte Motions and Oppositions.
 - ii. Affidavit re Real Property of Small Value.
 - iii. Bonds.
 - iv. Estate Planning Documents.
 - v. Wills and Codicils.

- vi. Subpoenas.
 - vii. Letters of Administration/Testamentary/Conservatorship/
Guardianship.
 - i. In Family matters:
 - i. Judgments.
 - ii. Notice of Entry of Judgment.
 - iii. Abstract of Judgment.
 - iv. Ex Partes and responses to ex partes / Contempts.
 - v. Opposition to Commissioner.
 - vi. Writs.
 - vii. Subpoenas.
 - j. In Small Claims matters:
 - i. Subpoenas.
 - ii. Certificate of Facts -DL30.
4. Courtesy copies of electronically-filed documents are not required unless ordered by a judicial officer in a specific matter.
5. All remaining provisions of Local Rule 2.87 continue in effect.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 2, 2026




HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

Accordingly, it is **FURTHER ORDERED** that, upon confirmation that all charges resulting in conviction that are the subject of a pending motion for conviction relief before this Court have in fact been expunged by the Department of Justice under Penal Code §1203.425:

1. The Clerk shall issue written notification to the parties to the pending motion, which shall include the docket number of the case on which expungement was granted, stating: "The California Department of Justice has confirmed that the petitioner in this case has been granted conviction relief pursuant to California Penal Code §1203.425. Accordingly, petitioner need not calendar a motion date with this Court for conviction relief."
2. The Clerk shall enter dismissal of the associated petition seeking conviction relief.

Dated: December 18, 2025



HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

**STANDING ORDER RE: PERMISSIVE E-
FILING IN CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE
CASES**

NOVEMBER 16, 2023

Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1010.6(d) and Rules 2.252 and 2.253 of the California Rules of Court, the Court will permit e-filing in Criminal and Juvenile cases, as set forth in this standing order pending amendment to the Local Rules, effective November 27, 2023. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

1. Electronic filing shall be permitted in Criminal and Juvenile cases beginning on November 27, 2023. As Rule 2.252 of the California Rules of Court permits mandatory electronic filing only in Civil cases, nothing in this Order shall be interpreted as mandating electronic filing in either Criminal or Juvenile Delinquency case types. E-filing is optional in Juvenile Dependency cases.
2. The following documents **may not be electronically filed** and must still be filed/lodged in hard copy form unless otherwise ordered by the Presiding Judge or provided in an amended Local Rule or Standing Order:

a. In Criminal matters:

- i. Initial Complaints/Petitions.
- ii. Parole Revocation Filings.
- iii. Parole Warrants.
- iv. Post-Release Community Supervision Warrants.
- v. *Ramey* Warrants.
- vi. Search Warrants.
- vii. Waivers of Extradition.
- viii. Criminal Habeas Corpus Petitions.
- ix. Orders/Judgments.
- x. Challenges under Code of Civil Procedure §§ 170.1/170.3 and 170.6.
- xi. Ex Parte Motions and Oppositions.

b. In Juvenile matters:

- i. Initial Complaints/Petitions.
- ii. Reports and Recommendations.
- iii. Orders/Judgments.
- iv. Warrants.
- v. Challenges under Code of Civil Procedure §§ 170.1/170.3 and 170.6.
- vi. Ex Parte Motions and Oppositions.

3. Courtesy copies of electronically-filed documents are not required unless ordered by a judicial officer in a specific matter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 16, 2023



HON. EDWARD G. WEIL
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

DATE: SEPTEMBER 3, 2025
JUDGE: HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN

DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK: CAROLINE RUARO
UNREPORTED

CIVIL EX PARTE APPLICATIONS AND
MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT / ADJUDICATION

I. Civil Ex Parte Motions, Oppositions, and Hearings.

A. Application / Effective Date.

1. This order shall apply to ex parte applications in Unlimited and Limited Civil cases, and Unlimited Unlawful Detainer cases. It shall not apply to Family, Probate, Limited Unlawful Detainer, or Restraining Order cases. It shall become effective on **September 15, 2025**.
2. The Court will accept ex parte applications under existing procedures (appearance at set hours), through September 30, 2025. Thereafter, applications must follow the process in this order.

B. Notice to Parties. Notice of the filing of an ex parte application must be provided to the opposing party or their counsel no later than 10:00 a.m. the day before the application will be presented to the Court, absent a showing of exceptional circumstances justifying a shorter notice period, as provided in California Rules of Court, rule 3.1203. A declaration regarding notice must be submitted with the ex parte application papers.

C. Notice to Court: The party seeking ex parte relief must provide email notification to the assigned department no later than 10:00 am on the court day before the ex parte determination.

D. Ex Parte Application Papers. All ex parte papers shall be served and submitted to the Clerk's Office no later than 3:00 pm the day before the ex parte determination. Submissions shall be filed electronically unless the party is self-represented and has not elected to participate in electronic filing. Papers may be served on the parties personally or electronically. The moving party must notify the Court if an opposition is expected.

E. Opposition to Ex Parte Application. Oppositions to the ex parte relief requested shall be submitted to the Clerk's Office and served on the party making the request as soon as possible, but not later than 10:00 a.m. on the

day of the ex parte determination. Submissions shall be filed electronically unless the party is self-represented and has not elected to participate in electronic filing. The opposition must be personally or electronically served on the other party and proof of service must be submitted with the opposition at the time it is filed.

- F. **Request for Appearance at Hearing.** If either party requests to appear on the application or opposition, the application or opposition must state this request on the face page of the ex parte application and/or opposition. Hearings will only occur if ordered by the Court. The Court will notify the parties of the date and time of the hearing on the ex parte request.
- G. **Decisions on Ex Parte Applications.** The Court will endeavor to rule on the application within 24 hours of the date scheduled for the ex parte determination, or 24 hours after the hearing if one is scheduled. Applications with extensive briefing may require more time for the Court to decide.

II. Motions for Summary Judgment / Adjudication

- A. **Application / Effective Date.** This order shall apply to motions for summary judgment / adjudication filed in Unlimited and Limited Civil cases. It shall not apply to Family, Probate, or Unlawful Detainer matters. It shall become effective on **September 15, 2025**.
- B. **Reservations.** Parties moving for summary judgment/adjudication must reserve a hearing date and time prior to filing any moving papers. Reservations may be requested by email to the department. The Court will respond with the date and time of the scheduled hearing.
- C. **Filing of Motion.** Once the reservation date is confirmed by the Court, the moving party shall have **seven (7) calendar days** to file the moving papers with the Court. Failure to file the moving papers within this period may result in the reserved hearing time being vacated by the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 3, 2025



HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

Superior Court of California
County of Contra Costa

FILED
MAY 15 2015

STEPHEN H. NASH, CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
By: K. Cardinale, Deputy Clerk
K. Cardinale

1
2
3 Dangerous, Toxic, Bio-Hazardous Material) Order re Return of Dangerous, Toxic, Bio-
4 _____) Hazardous Material/Exhibits

5 It is hereby **ORDERED THAT:**

6 The Court will not store dangerous, toxic or bio-hazardous materials as exhibits in any case,
7 including but not limited to drugs, paraphernalia, paint, bodily fluids, urine and weapons. The party
8 intending to introduce any of these above referenced materials shall bring photographs of the materials on
9 the date they intend to introduce the materials in court. This photograph will be marked and substituted
10 for the materials when the court finds good cause to do so.

11 Pursuant to Penal Code 1417.3, at any time prior to the final determination of the action or
12 proceeding, exhibits offered by the state or defendant shall be returned to the party offering them by order
13 of the court when an exhibit poses a security, storage or safety problem, as recommended by the clerk of
14 the court. Upon court order, the clerk shall substitute a full and complete photographic record of any
15 exhibit or part of any exhibit returned under this section. The submitting party shall produce said
16 photographs.

17 Exhibits toxic by nature that pose a health hazard to humans shall be introduced to the court in the
18 form of a photographic records and written chemical analysis certified by a competent authority. Where
19 the court finds that good cause exists to depart from this procedure, toxic exhibits may be brought into the
20 courtroom and introduced. However, following introduction of the exhibit, the person or persons
21 previously in possession of the exhibit shall take responsibility for it and the court shall not store the
22 exhibit.

23 Dated: 5/15/15

24
25 [Signature]
Honorable Steven K. Austin, Presiding Judge

FILED
SEP 14 2015
gc

STEPHEN H. NASH CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
By: *[Signature]*, Deputy Clerk

1 SHARON L. ANDERSON (SBN 94814)
County Counsel
2 STEVEN P. RETTIG (SBN 178477)
Assistant County Counsel
3 COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA
P.O. Box 69, Co. Admin. Bldg.
4 Martinez, CA 94553-0116
Tel: (925) 335-1830
5 Fax (925) 646-2461

6 Attorney for Petitioner,
Children & Family Services Bureau
7

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
9 COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

10 In re the matter of:

#6
) STANDING ORDER AUTHORIZING
) CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES
) BUREAU TO REGULARLY
) PHOTOGRAPH DEPENDENT
) CHILDREN FOR IDENTIFICATION
) AND DOCUMENTATION PURPOSES

11
12
13
14 persons coming under the Juvenile
Court law.
15

16 The Court finds that Contra Costa County Children & Family Services manages
17 approximately 1100 open Dependency cases annually. Given the volume of cases and the
18 number of workers involved, as well as the regular transfer of cases that occurs between
19 different units and the rate of turnover among workers, there is a need for a court order to
20 authorize Children and Family Services to regularly photograph children in protective
21 custody and/or Dependents in order to be able to accurately identify the children when
22 providing the children and their families with needed services. Photographic
23 documentation of Dependent children and youth provides added assurance that despite
24 file transfers and case worker turnover, the appropriate children and youth are served by
25 Children & Family Services.

26 The Court also finds that having photographs of dependent children will aid in
27 facilitating the recovery of missing or AWOL children.

28 ///

1 Based upon these findings, the Court hereby makes the following Standing Order:

2 Contra Costa County Children & Family Services/Employment and Human
3 Services Department is hereby authorized to:

4 Photograph children in protective custody and/or Dependent children who have
5 been placed outside the home at regular intervals and maintain such photographs in the
6 child's file in an effort to accurately document and record the child's identity for the
7 purpose of providing services to the child and his/her family.

8 Any photographs of Dependent children taken by Contra Costa County Children &
9 Family Services pursuant to this Standing Order shall be maintained in the child's file and
10 remain a confidential record pursuant to the provisions of California Welfare and
11 Institutions Code 827 et. seq.

12 This Order shall be a Standing Order of this Court effective immediately, and shall
13 remain in effect unless superseded or rescinded by a subsequent order.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: *Sept. 14, 2015*


THOMAS M. MADDOCK
Supervising Juvenile Court Judge

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

FILED
AUG 11 2021

K. BIEKER CLERK OF THE COURT
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA

DATE: AUGUST 11, 2021
JUDGE: REBECCA HARDIE

DEPARTMENT 1
COURT CLERK: AIDA CHEONG
UNREPORTED

By

Deputy Clerk

STANDING ORDER 7.15 RE: COURT REPORTERS IN FAMILY LAW CASES

The Court has provided reporters in Family Law cases generally since July 1, 2019, and amended its Local Rule 2.52 and 2.53 accordingly. These reporters are not officially assigned to specific departments but are assigned based on need. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the urgent need for the Court to have the ability to reassign reporters to meet statutory and constitutional mandates in other types of cases, **IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Court may move reporters from Family Law to perform reporting services in other court departments, except for those Family Law cases where a reporter is required by statute or case law.
2. Parties in Family Law proceedings in which court reporters will not be provided may provide their own as set forth in Local Rule 2.52. For litigants with a fee waiver, a request for a court reporter shall be filed on Local Form MC-30 at least three calendar days before the hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 11, 2021



HON. REBECCA HARDIE
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

DATE: MARCH 16, 2026

JUDGE: HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN

DEPARTMENT 1

**COURT CLERK: CAROLINE RUARO
UNREPORTED**

STANDING ORDER RE: WEAPONS SCREENING

I. Entry Directives

- a. Pursuant to the general authority conferred upon the Court under Code of Civil Procedure sections 128 and 187, persons entering any location of the Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa, in which a weapons-screening station is in use must enter through one of the security check points. Such persons may be required to pass through the weapons-screening station and/or submit to a search of their person and belongings.
- b. Persons entering any court location by way of a point of entry where a weapons-screening station is not in use are subject to a search of their person and belongings for concealed weapons and/or soft body armor.

II. Prohibition of Entry

- a. Any person refusing to pass through a weapons-screening station, or refusing to submit to a search of their person and belongings, will be denied entry into the building, except for the following:
 - i. Elected public officers (but not their deputies or assistants) under Article 6, Section 16 (a judge of a court of record) or Article 11 Section 1 (an elected county sheriff, an elected district attorney, an elected assessor, and an elected governing body) of the Constitution of California;
 - ii. Deputies or assistants of elected office holders, appointed office holders, or employees of the County or Court who display an employment identification card or other verifiable proof of office or employment that is approved by the Contra Costa County Sheriff and acknowledged by Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office staff at the weapons-screening station; and
 - iii. Persons issued proximity cards by the Court, the General Services Agency, and/or the County of Contra Costa who enter the court by separate entrance controlled by proximity cards.

- b. Nothing in this order shall be interpreted to prohibit an authorized member of the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office from, in the exercise of their lawful discretion, denying entry to any person.

III. Prohibition of Armed/Armored Entry

- a. Except for peace officers who are at a courthouse on official court business (as defined below), any person in possession of any weapon described in Section 171b of the California Penal Code, or any person in possession of any object reasonably deemed capable of being used as a deadly or dangerous weapon by the Contra Costa County Sheriff, will be denied entry into the building. Any peace officer who is not on official court business, as defined below, must surrender any weapons or return without them and may reclaim any surrendered weapons upon exit from the courthouse.
- b. Except for peace officers authorized by the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, any person wearing soft body armor will also be denied entry into the building.
- c. "Official Court business" means specifically:
 - i. Deputies and employees of the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office, and any officer or deputy of a law enforcement agency who is present at the request of the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office to provide mutual aid and/or assist with security;
 - ii. Other peace officers present at the courthouse to testify in a case, to be designated at any proceeding as an "investigating officer", to meet with employees of the District Attorney's Office in their official capacity, to accompany or provide transportation for a witness or other person associated with a case, to obtain a paper or hard copy warrant, to perform a records check, or to make a criminal arrest pursuant to a warrant; or
 - iii. District Attorney investigators who are present in their professional capacity.

IV. Other Prohibited Items

- a. Except as otherwise provided herein, all persons are prohibited from entering a courthouse or facility with any prohibited item. Examples of prohibited items include, but are not limited to:

- i. Firearms/Ammunition
- ii. Knives (pocket knife, belt buckle knife, etc.)
- iii. Metal Knuckles
- iv. Chains, including wallet chains
- v. Tools (hammer, screwdriver, wrench, etc.)
- vi. Pepper spray, mace or tear gas
- vii. Cutting instruments (Scissors, letter opener, box cutter, hatchet, sword, etc.)
- viii. Handcuffs/handcuff keys
- ix. Syringes (other than for medical use)
- x. Knitting needles, sewing needles, large safety pins
- xi. Glass Containers, ice picks, corkscrews and metal eating utensils
- xii. Lighters, torches, flammable liquids
- xiii. Chemicals/Fertilizers that are corrosive or flammable
- xiv. Explosives
- xv. Skateboards, golf clubs, and bats
- xvi. Alcohol
- xvii. Illegal drugs or paraphernalia
- xviii. Laser Pointers
- xix. Graffiti tools – markers, paint, etching tools, etc.
- xx. Large poster board sheets or signs
- xxi. Cameras or audio recording devices, unless the camera or recording device is approved for use under Rule of Court 1.150, or by the court's ADA Coordinator, Presiding Judge, or designee.

- b. Nothing in this order shall be interpreted to prohibit an authorized member of the Contra Costa County Sheriff's Office from, in the exercise of their lawful discretion, prohibiting an item from being brought into the courthouse if they reasonably suspect the item may compromise the security of the building or the safety of the court and court staff, other court users, or the general public.

V. Operational Control

- a. All weapons-screening station operations shall be under the direction of the Contra Costa County Office of the Sheriff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 16, 2026



HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN
 Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
 Contra Costa County

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA**

DATE: JULY 8, 2026

JUDGE: HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN

DEPARTMENT 1

**COURT CLERK: CAROLINE RUARO
UNREPORTED**

STANDING ORDER RE: BAIL SCHEDULE

Due to a clerical error, the narrative section of the Felony and Misdemeanor Bail Schedules each had a single error concerning the impact of failures to appear on bail conditions. Specifically, each narrative stated that arrestees will be subject to a bail condition if they have "more than two" failures to appear for any criminal case in the preceding twelve months. However, the remaining sentences in each section consistently provide that the arrestee having "two or more prior failures to appear within the preceding twelve months" is a basis to require the arrestee to post cash bail.


The intent of the schedules as approved is to require bail conditions for offenses otherwise designated as CR or BR where an arrestee has **two or more** failures to appear in the preceding twelve months. Good cause therefore appearing, the Court now **ORDERS** as follows:

1. In Section I(B)(5)(a) of the narrative section of the Felony Bail Schedule, the first sentence of the third full paragraph is amended to read as follows: "If an arrestee has two or more failures to appear for any criminal case in the preceding twelve months, the arrestee will be subject to a bail condition for the new arrest offense."
2. In Section I(B)(4)(a) of the narrative section of the Misdemeanor Bail Schedule, the first sentence of the third full paragraph is amended to read as follows: "If an arrestee has two or more failures to appear for any criminal case in the preceding twelve months, the arrestee will be subject to a bail condition for the new arrest offense."

This order shall remain in effect until otherwise ordered or until superseded by an amendment to the Bail Schedules approved by a vote of the Judges of this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 8, 2026



HON. CHRISTOPHER R. BOWEN
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court
Contra Costa County