



THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

Historical Society

NEWSLETTER • FALL/WINTER 2010



CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE CALIFORNIA COURTS OF APPEAL — MORE THAN ONE HUNDRED APPELLATE JUSTICES AND MEMBERS OF THE SUPREME COURT GATHER AT THE MILLENNIUM BILTMORE HOTEL IN LOS ANGELES, APRIL 10, 2005. CHIEF JUSTICE RONALD M. GEORGE IS SEATED, LEFT OF CENTER. PLEASE SEE THE RELATED STORY ON THE APPELLATE COURT LEGACY PROJECT IN THIS ISSUE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Wednesdays with the Chief
 Jake Dear 2

*Judicial Council Retirement Tribute
 and Presentation Honoring
 Chief Justice Ronald M. George*
 Jake Dear 5

Appellate Court Legacy Project
 Paula R. Bocciardi 8

*2010 Student Writing Competition
 Winners Announced* 23

*California Supreme Court Holds
 2010 Outreach Session in Fresno* . . 24

*California Legal History Journal
 Volume 5, 2010 Now Available* . . . 26

Member News 28

Membership Donors 2009–2010 . . . 31

Wednesdays with the Chief

(A CHARMING AND MULTI-TASKING MICRO-MANAGER)

JAKE DEAR*



Chief Justice Ronald M. George (RIGHT) and Chief Supervising Attorney Jake Dear.

As most court observers know, the seven justices of the California Supreme Court meet every Wednesday morning (except during oral argument week) at 9:15 a.m. around a large dark walnut table in Chief Justice Ronald M. George's fifth floor chambers in the Earl Warren Building, alone behind a heavy oak door. Standing outside, during the first few minutes of the meeting, one hears muffled conversation from inside, often punctuated by group laughter, before the justices get down to business.

First they discuss the progress of granted cases working their way through the court — does Justice X's circulating draft opinion in *People v. Jones* adequately respond to Justice Y's concurring and dissenting opinion such that it retains a majority vote of four justices? Is there sufficient agreement with Justice Z's "calendar memorandum" in *Williams v. Smith* that we can set it for the next oral argument calendar? And so on. Next they tackle the "conference list" — typically 200-400 petitions for review and for writs, and an accompanying four-inch stack of internal memos prepared by court staff, describing, analyzing and making recommendations in each matter. From this list and these memos they decide which few cases merit full review by the court (oral argument and

*Chief Supervising Attorney, California Supreme Court.

opinion), and they dispose of the rest in a variety of ways, mostly by straight denial. Then the meeting breaks up, the door to the Chief's conference room opens, and the justices emerge into the anteroom, animated, chatting, making small talk with each other and the Chief's secretaries and any of his legal staff who happen to be there, before walking the halls back to their own chambers.

Except on July 14, 2010, when the justices emerged from the Chief's chambers looking ashen and with reddened, moist eyes. He had waited until the end of conference to mention, with a glimmer in his eye, that it was Bastille Day, and that,

by the way, after considerable reflection, he would not seek reelection to a new 12-year term and would instead retire, after 38 years as a judge, and 14 as Chief.

The shock has since been absorbed up and down the halls of the court, and throughout the state. Editorial writers have lauded the Chief's vision and recounted his many administrative accomplishments: among other things, stabilized trial court funding; unification of the municipal and superior courts into one superior court in each county; and state/ judicial branch ownership and control of county courthouses. And of course many have focused on his courage and craft in authoring more than a few landmark decisions. In the same vein, numerous bar groups have bestowed ever more engraved honors — crystal or glass sculptures, and plaques that threaten to overwhelm his commodious chambers — along with letters and bouquets from judicial and political leaders statewide and nationwide. Most recently, in late October, the Judicial Council sponsored a two-hour tribute memorializing the Chief's career and tenure. (See accompanying article, *Judicial Council Retirement Tribute and Presentation Honoring Chief Justice Ronald M. George*, describing the event and the Society's sponsorship.)

To that broad macro view of the Chief's public accomplishments, I'll add some brief personal obser-

vations about the Chief's hands-on approach to the behind-the-scenes daily workings within the California Supreme Court itself.

In addition to all of the systemic reforms for which he has become and will long be known, the Chief also is one of seven justices on the California Supreme Court, and in that capacity he has opinions to prepare and a court to run. Those tasks require focus on two matters, simultaneously: quality and productivity. He is proud of the court's tradition as a leading and influential judicial body, and he has always made it clear that the quality of his, and the court's, decisions is paramount. At the same time, he is aware that matters before the court must be resolved at a reasonably efficient pace, and that the court needs to maintain a respectable level of productivity, measured by, among other things, its annual output of filed opinions. In this regard, I'll focus on something that others have not discussed — my perspective of the Chief as a persistent, yet charming, multitasking nudger with a keen attention to detail.

His operating principle is an extreme version of the maxim, "Don't put off for tomorrow that which you can do today." As his administrative and attorney staff can attest, when he receives a draft memo, he often returns it within hours. Very lengthy memos may stay with him for a few days or longer — after all, there's a lot of competing paper in his rolling briefcase — but once he's made his edits, he's in no mood for further delay. And what edits they are. In addition to refining clarity and improving focus, he has an uncanny ability to spot (or sniff out) errors, large and small, in any material that's presented to him. He calls you into chambers, discusses the changes, and then nicely lets it be known that he wants the revised memo to circulate as early as possible that afternoon (after he approves and personally proofreads the revised version) so that it will be logged into the court's internal tracking system as of that time and date, and hence start the clock running for other chambers to respond. This get-it-done-correctly-and-promptly approach, and variations of it, is how he manages the huge amount of material that overflows his inbox hourly.

My most direct observations of the Chief in "manager mode" relate to our private meetings following each Wednesday conference. After the conference concludes and the justices leave his chambers, I receive a call from one of his two secretaries: "The Chief is ready to see you now." I gather some papers and walk a few steps down the hall to his chambers, to go over the conference results and related matters concerning cases pending within the court. Our meeting lasts between 15 minutes to one hour, depending on his schedule, and it provides a glimpse of the Chief in high administrative/multitasking form.

"First, the salmon course," he says. We pick up the "salmon list" (so-called because of the color of paper on which it's printed), setting out the status of each case that's been argued, and for which an opinion is due to circulate. Our discussion is punctuated with substantive asides about a few problematic cases, and then the phone rings. He's informed that "Senator 'A' is on the line." He tells me "this will take just a minute," takes the call, finishes, and without missing a beat, moves to the next case on the list. It proceeds like this, with other interruptions: "Court of Appeal Justice 'B' is calling. . . ." Two minutes later we are back to the salmon sheet. He's concerned that Justice "X" still has not circulated an opinion in an overdue matter. He mentions that he's already touched on this with his colleagues at conference, but could I please also gently contact that justice's staff, and ask about the status? I make a note to do so. And by the way, that reminds him — he digs into his left pants pocket and out comes his wad of paper scrap notes — an inch thick, organized in a fashion that only he understands, and he sifts through them: It's a jotting that he wrote at least a week ago, about a wholly separate matter. "Could you please look into this [case, statute, news article] and follow up on that?"

We then review the "blue list" (again so-called because of the color of paper on which it's printed), detailing the status of each case in which a pre-argument "calendar memo" has been circulated, but that has not yet been argued. We discuss a case in which Justice "Y" is a bit overdue in circulating an internal "preliminary response" — necessary before the court can set the matter for argument. There was some discussion of this matter at conference, and the justice promised to issue his response soon. The Chief, ever vigilant, says, "If that doesn't happen within the next few days, will you please follow up with his staff?" I make a note to do so. The phone rings; a trial judge is on the line, can the Chief speak with him now? Two minutes later we resume, only to be interrupted again by his private phone. His wife, Barbara, is calling. "I'm just going though the conference with Jake," he says. A minute or two later, after he quickly discusses plans for that evening's social engagement (tonight, opera; other times it's a charity or bar event, the ballet, a dinner party, or a visit by one of his three sons), we return to the list. Two cases have progressed sufficiently that the court has agreed to set them for the annual "on the road" oral argument session, to be held this year in the Central Valley, but another case, also targeted for that special session, has stalled. "Let's add a note to the next calendar conference memo that the court is targeting this case for the special session, and asking all chambers to act on it in time to make that calendaring decision in the next two weeks." I'll incorporate that notation to the "calendar conference memo," setting the agenda for next week's calendar-

ing discussions, which the Chief will circulate within the court later that afternoon.

In the meantime, one of his secretaries brings in lunch — frequently, in recent months, it's tuna, often without bread. At this point I run to the staff fridge to get my own half sandwich, and we picnic at the big table, talking briefly about family issues (“so how’s Adam?”) or former court employees, restaurants, and politics — United States and international. If I say something that he wants to follow up on, he takes out his wad of paper scraps, finds an appropriate clear area, and jots down some words. At that point he gets up and walks over to his rolling brief case, parked near the door: “That reminds me, I have an article for you from over the weekend.” It’s from the *New York Times* business section, and has been carefully cut out, with an arrow pointing to my circled name in red ink in the upper right corner. After I share with him a slice of apple or pear, he says, “All right, let’s turn to the conference list.”

This third internal court document of the day sets forth all of the 200-400 matters acted upon by the court earlier in the morning. We go through the 20-40 most important cases on the list, noting the votes (“denied; Justices ‘X’ and ‘Y’ would have granted”), and he relays pertinent comments by the justices concerning certain cases, or about the internal memo prepared by staff for the court concerning the case. Concerning one matter that the court transferred back to the intermediate appellate court, the justices revised the proposed order language — could I please bring that change to the attention of the appropriate clerical and attorney staff for future reference? The phone rings; a journalist is calling to interview him for a story about a recent Judicial Council matter. Ever cognizant of the 4:00 p.m. press deadline, he takes the call, and addresses the questions with carefully-worded candor. Back to the conference — where were we? Item number 20, *Smith v. Jones* — the court granted review after a spirited discussion and despite a recommendation by the writer of the internal memo, that the matter be denied. He’s thinking of assigning the case to Justice “X,” but has some hesitation; maybe it would be a better fit for Justice “Y”? He’ll finalize that decision by the end of the day (after consulting his own hand-written tally of matters already assigned to each justice) when I give him a draft of the assignment memo, which he will edit and then



The Chief leaving with rolling briefcase.

promptly send out to his fellow justices. And finally, concerning another matter in which the court granted review: “We want to make sure that the assigned justice considers, and promptly prepares a memo for the court concerning, whether we should expand briefing to address the additional issue mentioned on page 7 of the conference memo” — and so he asks me to incorporate that notation into the draft assignment memo. And how about that? — only one interruption in the past 15 minutes.


Back to Bastille Day 2010: I’ll never forget that post-conference meeting with the Chief. Because of his surprise announcement,

there were more than the normal number of interruptions that afternoon — including a couple calls from the Governor’s office — and our meeting progressed in fits and starts, sandwiched between in-person and telephone interviews that he’d spontaneously agreed to give to various members of the media. Instead of finishing at our normal time of about 12:30 or 1:00 p.m., I was still at the conference table with him at 4:50 p.m. We were concluding our discussion of the conference list, when we were interrupted: Yet another radio station was on the line, requesting a live interview — at least the fourth that afternoon. “All right,” he said, “as long as the questions will be from the reporters, and not call-in listeners.” We continued to work through the conference list as we could hear, on speakerphone, the radio station producer cueing the two radio station anchors, while in the background we heard the end of a commercial for a roofing business. And then we went live for an eight-minute interview. As the Chief spoke — naturally, extemporaneously, and yet carefully, elegantly answering wide-ranging questions about court unification, state funding for courthouses, and of course the marriage decisions — he continued to jot notes about matters from the petition conference, and slide them across the big table to me. When I commented afterward that I’d not expected that even he could multitask like that while being interviewed by two journalists live on radio, he responded that he knew I hoped to catch a 5:10 bus and didn’t want to delay me.

That’s the kind of frenetic approach and pace the Chief kept, and that’s how and why he got so much done — inside and outside the court. He’s one of a kind — the most effective and charming multi-tasking micro-manager that anyone could ever hope (or dare) to meet. ☆

Judicial Council Retirement Tribute and Presentation Honoring Chief Justice Ronald M. George

JAKE DEAR*



*The Chief Justice
and Mrs. Barbara George.*

On October 28, 2010, in the Auditorium of the Hiram W. Johnson Building in San Francisco (adjoining the Earl Warren Building, where the Supreme Court is headquartered), the Judicial Council of California hosted a retirement tribute to Chief Justice Ronald M. George. Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Director William C. Vickrey served as master of ceremonies for a gathering of approximately 200 judicial, legislative and executive branch leaders and justice system partners (including Society President David McFadden) — plus the Chief Justice's legal and administrative staff.

The program featured a round table discussion moderated by lawyer and journalist Manuel A. Medrano, addressing the Chief's legal decisions and administrative accomplishments. Panelists were Court of Appeal Justice Judith D. McConnell; Professor J. Clark Kelso; former Judge Terry B. Friedman; and AOC Chief Deputy Director Ronald G. Overholt. Medrano also conducted an impromptu live interview of the Chief.

Interspersed throughout the event were four video presentations. The first was a montage career retrospective with family photos of the Chief — including images of him up close and personal with a Tanzanian giraffe, a Burmese python, and lots of Antarctic penguins. Two other messages were from former United

*Chief Supervising Attorney, California Supreme Court.



*Administrative Office of the Courts Director
William C. Vickrey opens the program.*



Chief Justice-elect Tani Cantil-Sakauye presents a gift from the Judicial Council to Chief Justice Ronald M. George



The panel discussion (LEFT TO RIGHT) — Manuel A. Medrano, moderator; Prof. J. Clark Kelso; AOC Chief Deputy Director Ronald G. Overholt; Court of Appeal Justice Judith D. McConnell; and former Judge Terry B. Friedman.

States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, and Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court Chief Justice Margaret Marshall. Justice O'Connor said: "You've been a marvelous Chief Justice. You've made us proud all across the country and you've exercised wonderful leadership within California Courts. We've looked to you for good examples for all the years of your service." Chief Justice Marshall proclaimed herself "President of the worldwide fan club of Ronald George," and proceeded to extol his virtues as "a visionary leader" who had made the California courts "a national model"; and as "a gracious, generous human being who is deeply committed to access to justice and to an impartial interpretation of the laws — for everybody." Finally, in video that was submitted at the last minute, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger beamed into the camera and intoned: "Quite frankly, I'm surprised the FPPC wasn't on your case for not registering as a lobbyist based on the number of times I saw you in my office around the Capitol constantly advocating for the courts. . . ."


Court of Appeal Justice (and Chief Justice-Elect) Tani Cantil-Sakauye spoke and presented a gift from the Judicial Council — an iPad for a famously computer-shy fellow. Turning around a phrase that he had used a few years ago to describe his own technological prowess, she told him with a wink that he'd no longer be allowed to claim the title of "roadkill . . . on the information superhighway."

Some of the biggest smiles of the evening were earned by the melodious duo, Professor Kelso and Justice Moreno (the latter under a smart fedora) who serenaded the Chief with an appropriately modified version of Paul Anka's *My Way*. The closing verse:

"So here we are, Ronald M. George
 With work well done, ahead you forge
 You have our love, you always will
 You leave behind big robes to fill
 From one and all, we're glad to say
 You did it your way."

The crowd loved it.

After brief closing remarks from the Chief, the party repaired upstairs to the Great Hall, where all participated in a toast by Supreme Court Justice Marvin R. Baxter, commemorating the Chief as a court and judicial council colleague. Finally, Society President David McFadden and the other guests looked on as Court of Appeal Justice Brad R. Hill unveiled and dedicated a stunning three-dimensional glass and metal plaque, permanently affixed to the wall of the Great Hall, honoring the Chief Justice and his wife, Barbara George, and bearing a photo of the dashing couple. ★



Three-dimensional glass and metal plaque permanently affixed to the wall of the Great Hall. The plaque, sponsored in part by the Society, reads:

ART & JUSTICE

In 1998, following a nearly 10-year exile imposed by the Loma Prieta earthquake, the California Supreme Court returned to its newly restored historic courthouse in the Civic Center Complex. The courthouse elegantly blends the traditional grandeur of our past with the modern architecture of the adjoining new state office building in which you stand.

The art collection that graces these buildings has its origins in the leadership of one individual: Barbara George, wife of Chief Justice Ronald M. George and former chairperson of the California Arts Council. Mrs. George assembled an unprecedented collection of court-related material, culminating in a series of photographs of California's historic county courthouses. Her leadership as chairperson of the Art Committee for this complex resulted in a magnificent public art collection by California artists whose visions and styles reflect the rich diversity of our state. Thank you, Mrs. George.

Dedicated October 28, 2010.

This recognition was made possible by contributions from the California Supreme Court Historical Society, the California Bar Foundation, and the Ralph and Shirley Shapiro Family Foundation.

Appellate Court Legacy Project

PAULA R. BOCCIARDI*

“History,” said the late U.S. Supreme Court Justice Lewis F. Powell, “balances the frustration of ‘how far we have to go’ with the satisfaction of ‘how far we have come.’”

How far the California judicial system has evolved is revealed in the wisdom and experiences shared by the more than 80 retired and active justices of the state Courts of Appeal who have been interviewed for the California Appellate Court Legacy Project.

The Legacy Project is an oral history endeavor that evolved from statewide efforts undertaken to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the California Courts of Appeal in 2005. Overseeing this ambitious venture is the Appellate Court Legacy Project Committee, chaired by Associate Justice Judith L. Haller of the Fourth District Court of Appeal, Division One. Committee members are Hon. Timothy A. Reardon (First District); Hon. Laurence D. Rubin (Second District); Hon. George W. Nicholson (Third District); Hon. Rebecca A. Wiseman (Fifth District) [former member Hon. Steven M. Vartebedian retired May 31, 2010]; Hon. Richard J. McAdams (Sixth District); and Frances M. Jones, Judicial Center Law Librarian.

To date, all available retired state Court of Appeal justices have been interviewed (as well as active senior justices who may be nearing retirement), and the committee will continue ensuring that interviews are conducted with justices soon after they retire from the bench. Because the California Supreme Court Historical Society has undertaken the project of interviewing retired state Supreme Court justices, the committee is focusing only on the Courts of Appeal.

The videotaped interviews — averaging from one to two hours in length — are typically conducted by active or retired justices from the same court as the interview subject. Questions are tailored to the interviewee but generally cover the justice’s childhood, education, military service, family, judicial career, notable decisions, colleagues, judicial philosophy, community activities, and life in retirement. The footage is transferred directly to DVD and stored along with a transcript and a binder of biographical materials in the California Judicial Center Law Library (CJCL) in San Francisco. Costs of the project have been minimal because the bulk of the work has been accomplished by sitting appellate court justices and Administrative Office of the Courts staff.

*Staff to the Appellate Court Legacy Project Committee, Administrative Office of the Courts.

Access to the materials is provided to CJCL users in accordance with library policy. Remote users are able to request electronic versions of the transcripts via e-mail through the CJCL website (<http://library.courtinfo.ca.gov>). Each appellate district library also houses a collection of the DVDs.

To ensure that the Legacy Project continues to meet its fundamental objectives of facilitating research and educating the community about the history and role of the appellate courts, the committee is evaluating ways of expanding direct public access to the Legacy materials.

The committee has selected, for publication in this article, interview excerpts that highlight just a few of the many topics covered in the Legacy interviews. We hope that the excerpts will adequately reflect the countless compelling observations and anecdotes captured in this collection. For more information, or to see compilation videos of interview clips, visit the Legacy Project page on the California Courts public website at <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/courtsofappeal/>.

★ ★ ★

FROM THE CHIEF JUSTICE:

Six years ago, I appointed a statewide committee — comprising representatives from each of the six appellate court districts — to work with Administrative Office of the Courts staff on ways to commemorate the centennial of the California Courts of Appeal. As an expansion of that effort, I was especially pleased to approve the inception of the Appellate Court Legacy Project, which has resulted in one of the most ambitious and expansive judicial oral history collections in the country.

I have had the privilege of serving the state courts for more than 38 years, and during that time I have worked with many remarkable and dedicated men and women throughout the branch. All of them have stories to tell, and we are fortunate that the Legacy Project has been able to capture and preserve many of their perspectives about service on the bench, significant cases they have decided, and ways in which their personal experiences have shaped their judicial careers. The Legacy Project is a unique and inspiring endeavor, and I am very proud that we have had this opportunity to honor those who have served so ably before us and to preserve their recollections for the future.

— Hon. Ronald M. George, Chief Justice of California

FROM ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JUDITH HALLER,
CHAIR, APPELLATE COURT LEGACY
PROJECT COMMITTEE:

As a former graduate student working on a master's thesis in history, I recall hours spent poring over microfilm reels searching for details about President Lincoln's role in a piece of compromise legislation proffered shortly before the outbreak of the Civil War. If only I had had access to a videotape interview in which this topic was discussed.

When we launched the Legacy Project five years ago, we set out to capture a slice of California history as revealed in the lives of appellate court justices who influenced this state's legal landscape over the past 50 years. In doing so, we hoped to provide resource information for educators and research scholars, enhance the public's understanding of the judicial branch, and offer insight to those men and women who will serve our state in the future.

The personal stories captured in these video interviews range from those that are informative, touching, and inspirational to those that are funny, candid and some even unexpected. For me, this has been a labor of love. I am grateful to my fellow committee members and AOC staff members whose leadership and follow-through have made this project a reality. And, of course, our thanks go out to those retired justices who graciously shared their time and personal memories.

— *Hon. Judith L. Haller*

FROM LEGACY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Conducting the interviews of my former colleagues was a very enjoyable and informative experience for me. I had not seen some of the justices since their retirements, and thus the interviews presented an opportunity for me to get caught up. Many of the retired justices were sitting by assignment in the trial court; others were involved in private judging; some were teaching; some were traveling; and others were enjoying time with their families and friends. All seemed content and productive in retirement, and all seemed interested in giving back by sharing the experiences they had gained as attorneys and judges.

The interviews, as will be seen, covered a variety of relevant subjects, including childhood and upbringing, law school experiences, experiences as a practicing attorney, the judicial appointments process, life on the bench, notable cases, judicial philosophy, and extracurricular activities. These subjects and others were can-

didly discussed by the interviewees and provide a real insight into the justices' background, character, and accomplishments, and the work of the court.

It has been a real privilege and honor to have served as a member of the Appellate Court Legacy Project and to have the opportunity to create and preserve, through these interviews, an oral history of the California Courts of Appeal. I commend our Chairperson, Justice Judith Haller, and thank all who have participated in this Project.

— *Hon. Timothy A. Reardon*

Interviewing retired justices for the Legacy Project provided me with some of the most enjoyable experiences I have had in years. I suppose my participation was made easier by the fact that I knew all eight of the persons fairly well long before this process started. While asking about matters such as the justice's work experiences, judicial philosophy, and post-retirement activities all proved to be fruitful subjects, I personally found discussions about each interviewee's pre-bench life most intriguing.

I thought I had prepared well for each interview. I reviewed the biographical data provided by fellow committee member Fran Jones, as well as the information I obtained from other justices and court staff, and I had my own personal contacts with each interviewee, both from the past and in preparation for the interview. Nonetheless, once the camera and microphone were turned on, I heard many responses I did not necessarily expect to hear. And this spontaneity was not a bad thing.

Others have and will hear what I heard about such matters as childhood hardships that were overcome, persons and events that strongly influenced the interviewee's career path, and other personal-life matters that underscore the interviewee's public persona.

I will always cherish the time I spent with the fellow justices I interviewed and treasure that the Legacy Project preserves their stories.

— *Hon. Steven M. Vartebedian [former committee member]*

The California Judicial Center Library (CJCL)** provides support to the Appellate Court Legacy Project through research and by online access to information about the oral history interviews.

Before each interview, CJCL's research staff identifies biographical, decisional, and bibliographic data about the justice to be interviewed and compiles the results in background notebooks. Biographical data

**The California Judicial Center Library serves the California Supreme Court and the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District.

are retrieved from standard sources — e.g., *California Courts and Judges*. Searches in legal databases identify all of the cases for which the justice wrote a majority, concurring, or dissenting opinion. Bibliographic data are taken from library catalogs and legal periodical indexes. Copies of the background notebooks are delivered to the justice to be interviewed and to the interviewer, with one copy retained in the library's collection.

CJCL receives DVDs of all of the interviews [as do each of the California Courts of Appeal]. Descriptive entries in the library's catalog identify the background notebooks and DVDs. Access to the library's catalog is available via the library website, <http://library.courtinfo.ca.gov>.

CJCL's Special Collections & Archives staff index interview transcripts. Index terms appear in descriptive entries in the California Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal Database (Courts Database), also available via the website from a link on the homepage. Index entries provide a means of finding topics covered in one or more of the interviews by searching the Court Database.

Researchers interested in information about a retired justice can search the library catalog or the Courts Database using a surname as a keyword. For example, a search for information about Justice John G. Gabbert in the library catalog, using Gabbert as a keyword, retrieves identifying data for the background notebook and the DVD of his oral history interview. The same search in the Courts Database retrieves the descriptive entry for his interview, as well as an entry describing his term of service on the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District.

Transcripts of the interviews are not yet available online, but digital copies can be obtained by contacting Research & Reference Services by email to reference@jud.ca.gov or by phone to 415-865-7178. Additional information is available in Special Collections & Archives by email to archives@jud.ca.gov or by phone to 415-865-4383.

— Frances M. Jones, Director, California Judicial Center Library

FROM THE VIDEOGRAPHER:

I have the unique distinction of having been present for every one of the more than 80 Legacy Project interviews — as well as the one that inspired the project: the interview of the late Justice Robert Puglia (Third Appellate District) in early 2005 for the centennial of the California Courts of Appeal.

As Senior Media Production Specialist with the AOC's Education Division, I handle the technical aspects of the videotaping. For this project we are sim-

ply interested in an audio and video document. We tape the interviews at a location convenient for the justice, typically in a courtroom or at the justice's home. There are no editing changes or other enhancements made.

While each interview is unique, a few stand out. Particularly moving for me are the stories of obstacles and challenges that many of the justices had to overcome, and how many of these individuals were shaped by — and occasionally in spite of — strong family figures.

I consider myself fortunate to have recorded them all, and I look forward to attending many more in the future.


— David Knight, Senior Media Production Specialist, AOC

EDITOR'S NOTE: Appreciation is hereby expressed to all of the justices, their family members, and clerks who assisted in providing the photographs requested for this article.

★ ★ ★

CHILDHOOD/UPBRINGING

Justice Kane responding to Senator Howard Metzenbaum's inquiry about poverty during the Labor and Human Resources Committee's hearing regarding his nomination to the Legal Services board:



Hon. Robert F. Kane

I said, "Senator, my first vivid recollection of childhood is standing in a line with my sister and a couple of my brothers and my dad around the courthouse, I think it was, in Denver. I was about eight years old, seven, eight years old. That was a relief line for shoes. We had no water, no heat, electricity at home; we had no food, dad didn't have a job. We'd planted rutabagas and tomatoes out in the backyard and potatoes to try to get something to grow."

And I said, "That wasn't just one day—that was quite a while." I said, "So I think I have a pretty good idea, as much as anybody in this room, as to what it means to be poor."

And he just looked at me and quit. And I just felt good, and I felt good because I thought, maybe this will make it easier for the others when they come along.

— Hon. Robert F. Kane, First District, Div. Two

In 1941, December 7th, I remember what I was doing when Pearl Harbor was bombed; you know, rushing home. I'm 10 years of age. And the environment changed dramatically. People rushed off to join the service. It was a scary and anxious time. I remember at school you'd have planning for what happened if there were bombings, and so there were drills — bomb drills and things of that sort.



Hon. Howard B. Wiener

So it was a nervous time for four or five years: rationing of food, rationing of gasoline. I was a kid, and of course news was more carefully censored, shall I say; so you didn't see the horrors that you see today.

— Hon. Howard B. Wiener, Fourth District, Div. One

Justice Davis speaking about his mother, Pauline Davis, who served for 24 years in the California state Assembly after her husband, Assemblyman Lester Davis, died unexpectedly at the age of 47:



Hon. Rodney Davis

You have to realize that when I was growing up, Mom's opponents . . . would check on me to see what sort of dirt they could come up with. Anything to suggest — at that time, especially during the 1950s — that this mother, who was an assemblywoman, was neglecting her children was political dynamite. So they would come to my schools — my elementary schools — and ask questions of teachers and the principal. It was nasty times. I can remember, as a kid, my mother being involved in this nasty dispute involving labor unions and management up in Shasta County. And she had . . . one of the drive components of her vehicle manipulated so she lost the steering of her vehicle . . . after a meeting and skidded off the road. Another time, when we were going on Highway 36, they chased us. I can remember my mom . . . turning off the headlights on 36 and then cutting off onto this logging road and going behind these trees. And there we are in the pitch black while these two cars that were chasing her went back and forth, back and forth . . . looking for her. You know, I was just a young child, just scared to death.

— Hon. Rodney Davis, Third District

Justice Cooper reflecting upon events in the 1960s:



Hon. Candace D. Cooper


[T]hings have changed dramatically since I was a child. It's not like this was something my parents told me about. . . . I remember watching the civil rights movement on black and white TV, and the Montgomery march, and Martin Luther King. . . . The Watts riots were right in my neighborhood. My dad was on LAPD at that time. And I can remember we were kind of in a hilly area, and I can remember looking out our window and seeing L.A. burning. And not being able to cross Crenshaw, 'cause that was the curfew line at that time.

— Hon. Candace D. Cooper, Second District, Div. Eight

★ ★ ★

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Justice Alarcon on his being asked to be Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown's legal advisor on clemency and pardons:



Hon. Arthur L. Alarcon

I went back to the DA's office, and about three months later the Governor called me, and he said, "I would like you to be part of my staff and be my legal advisor, clemency and pardons secretary." And I said, "Governor, number one, I'm a Republican; and number two, I don't agree with a lot of your political positions, and while you're vehemently opposed to capital punishment, I am not opposed to capital punishment."

And he said, "I'm not selecting you for your political views; I'm selecting you because I think you would give me honest legal advice, and I have studied your background and I know your work." And I said, "Well, I really like what I'm doing." He said, "You know, it's not polite to turn the Governor down on the telephone. I want you to come to Sacramento." And I said, "I don't have the money to fly to Sacramento."

So he sent me the tickets and I went to Sacramento, and he charmed me into accepting the position.

— Hon. Arthur L. Alarcon, Second District, Div. Four

I was the principal co-author of the Agricultural Labor Relations Act; and that was really an interesting fight because, you know, trying to put everybody together. And I succeeded in putting the growers together with the production people and the farm-labor people and what-have-you and got the bill to the Governor's Office. I'll never forget that negotiation. We were all in the Governor's Office putting this whole thing together, and there was only one group that decided at the last minute to oppose us. And that was the lettuce industry, or a portion of the lettuce industry, I forget. . . . [B]ut the Agricultural Labor Relations Act became law, and it's the first act in the country, frankly, on labor relations. And I remember our congressman at that time . . . had a bunch of congressmen out here visiting him from all over the country, and he brought this item up; and I'll never forget this congressman from Mississippi, he says, "You'll never get a vote out of me, Mr. Sisk, over my dead body, for an Agricultural Labor Relations Act."

— Hon. George N. Zenovich, Fifth District



Hon. George N. Zenovich

I think that different types of law require different kinds of lawyers. I think trial lawyers are a different breed than, say, a corporate attorney would be. . . . [S]ome phases of law, like appellate work, are completely related to legal issues and the legal thought process; and trial work is related to people and the ability to convey ideas to all kinds of people — not just lawyers, but average people. So they take different kinds of skill sets, I think. And then when you get to the appellate level, then you add another complexity, and that is the ability to write. Because it's surprising that although some people can think clearly enough, they can't write clearly.

— Hon. Keith F. Sparks, Third District



Hon. Keith F. Sparks

Justice Deal describing an experience in one of her first trials:

And back in those days you had to put the surviving witnesses on the stand . . . and get all that testimony taken care of. . . . I'd gotten through that fine, and then I froze and I stood there, thinking, God! What am I supposed to do next? And Judge Curler, who was a very sympathetic man — had known me for years since I was a kid — looked down and he said, "Counsel may present the will now." Ah, that's what I'm supposed to do! . . . So I've always remembered that when I was a judge; that when young lawyers froze and needed some help, do it in such a way that it looks like it was their idea, save their face with their client. So that was a good lesson.

— Hon. Betty Barry Deal, First District, Div. Three



Hon. Betty Barry Deal


Justice Johnson recounting his experiences as deputy director of the then-new Neighborhood Legal Services Project in Washington, D.C., in 1964:

[W]e recruited some very good people [who] had ties in the community. . . . And so I got a lot of calls from judges. I remember one from landlord-tenant court who called up to say, "You know, this job used to be easy. Now my desk is stacked full of responsive papers from the tenants and so forth." He says, "They're trying to take every \$15 case to the Supreme Court!". . .

Laurie Zelon: In other words, the tenants were asserting their rights.

Earl Johnson: They were asserting their rights. And they were winning more often than not. . . . Simultaneously while this was happening, the War on Poverty was starting. And in fact, very early in the game, we got — in addition to the Ford funding that we had — we got a grant from OEO.

— Hon. Earl Johnson, Jr., Second District, Div. Seven



Hon. Earl Johnson, Jr.

Supreme Court Justice Carol Corrigan and Justice Parrilli reflecting on their days in the Alameda County D.A.'s Office:



Hon. Joanne C. Parrilli

Oh yes, my dear friend Martin Pulich. He was a mentor in a different way. He gave me confidence as a lawyer, first of all, because he treated us just the way he treated the guys. He gave us wild nicknames like he gave the guys. My nickname was “Piranha.” That was the nickname he gave me — a man-eating fish. He gave you “Barracuda,” as I recall.

CAROL CORRIGAN: He was in a fish phase at the time.

JOANNE PARRILLI: Yeah, he was in a fish phase at the time, and ultimately he I think nicknamed you Torquemada’s Handmaiden.

CAROL CORRIGAN: Oh, I want to thank you for putting that down on the historical record.

JOANNE PARRILLI: Oh, as a DA I think that was a wonderful moniker to have. And you know, he was so fair in what he did. I always felt that Judge Pulich set an example about how you had to do what the law required whether you liked it or not, and I admired that in him. And of course he was funny as the day is long.

— Hon. Joanne C. Parrilli, First District, Div. Three

On Justice Brauer’s nomination to the appellate court:



Hon. Harry F. Brauer

I had had some moments of anxiety about the confirmation process, because in my application to the Governor, I had written that my appellate opinions would be pithy and informed denunciations of the Supreme Court’s excesses.

And by some error in the Governor’s Office that was sent to the Chief. *[laughing]* But she was in a good mood, I think, or generous, and didn’t give me any trouble — except after the vote of confirmation, she told me pointedly that she was looking forward to my trenchant and pithy opinions. *[laughing]*


— Hon. Harry F. Brauer, Sixth District

NOTABLE CASES

I did have the first DNA case in Alameda County, *People v. Barney*, and we had a lengthy hearing — a Kelly-Frye hearing — before the trial on that one. The interesting thing about *Barney* was that the DNA evidence wasn’t dispositive. Mr. Barney dropped his wallet at the scene. . . . Which, of course, is how they found him and made the arrest. But it was pivotal in the sense that this was going to be the first DNA case, and very good lawyers on both sides. So it was that kind of excitement that I found as a trial judge that made the job worthwhile.

— Hon. Joanne C. Parrilli, First District, Div. Three

The first was *Boeken v. Philip Morris*, which was involving a person that died during trial from smoking cigarettes because of cancer. It was the first Southern California case where a multibillion dollar award was made against Philip Morris for fraud—\$3 billion, in fact, for punitive damages. . . .



Hon. J. Gary Hastings

A number of issues were raised on appeal, but the most significant one was punitive damages. The award in the trial court for compensatory damages was \$5.5 million. The punitive was \$3 billion. The trial court, Charles McCoy, an excellent judge, reduced it to \$100 million, and it came up to us and we reversed it to \$50 million.

We then had a rehearing because more cases from the United States Supreme Court had come out and we wanted to rehear it in light of those. We again held to our \$50 million, and ultimately the Supreme Court of California and the United States Supreme Court never took it, and that stands today.

The reason it was so significant in my mind is that that gave the factual background of what had happened since the early 1950s all the way up to the present with regard to how tobacco companies packaged their product, advertised their product; and if you ever read the decision, you will find out that we upheld the jury’s verdict for fraud.

— Hon. J. Gary Hastings, Second District, Div. Four

I must tell you that the single most rewarding moment that I ever had on the Court of Appeal occurred on a weekend with Bob Puglia. And the situation was one in which an initiative was headed for the ballot that would have created no-fault insurance in California. And the initiative was about 128 pages — typewritten pages — long, and a group brought a lawsuit to knock the initiative off the ballot on the ground that it violated the single-subject rule of the California Constitution that says an initiative can only embrace one subject. . . . [I]t was Bob Puglia's case. And he and I got into this case, and it turned out that what had happened was that in the 128 pages, it did indeed set up a system of no-fault insurance. . . . And right in the middle of the 128 pages, in a paragraph, was a provision that said something like, "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no law shall require any insurance company to report any political contributions that it makes in the state of California." Well, well, well, would you ever think that by voting for a no-fault insurance initiative that you would insulate the insurance industry from FPPC reporting requirements? Would anyone ever think that? . . . And we worked Saturday and Sunday, and by Sunday afternoon we had an opinion. And I forget who the third judge was on the case, but it was a unanimous opinion, and we filed the thing, kicked the thing off the ballot. So it's a published opinion — one of the few opinions in the state of California that actually kicks an initiative off the ballot, and a leading case, still, on the single-subject rule.

— Hon. Richard Sims III, Third District



Hon. Richard
Sims III

The other case, *Rosencrantz*, is a parole case. Rosencrantz was a murderer who killed a kid when he was 18 — killed his buddy's boyfriend for outing him to his father. He was . . . He is gay. And it was a terrible crime; there's no two ways about it. It was a horrendous crime. He was sentenced to 25 years to life. And the Parole Board kept denying parole, and kept



Hon. Miriam A. Vogel

denying parole, on a record that suggested that they were denying parole in large part because he was gay. And they were refusing to consider a lot of other factors. He was *the* model prisoner. He was everything we hope prisoners will be about behaving themselves while incarcerated and learning new skills. He got a college degree in computer science, he set up a whole system for the prison, he worked with other prisoners, and the Parole Board just wouldn't pay any attention to him. So the first *Rosencrantz* case, we ordered the Parole Board to hold a new hearing — which it did, and then it did the same thing all over again. So we ordered the Parole Board to release him. And the Supreme Court left both of those alone, but then it went to the Governor, and the Governor vacated the release and we ordered the Governor to vacate his decision. And that's when the Supreme Court stepped in and said no, there is some evidence here to support the Governor's decision. Now, the "some evidence" in *Rosencrantz* was the commitment offense, which, although I haven't followed this area of the law for the last year or so, I think the courts seemed to have backed off a bit. I think it was *Dannenberg*, where the Supreme Court said there really has to be a little more than just the unchanging facts of the commitment offense. . . . [T]he Parole Board was transforming a sentence of life with the possibility of parole into a sentence of life without the possibility of parole. . . . And I think that was a place where judicial intervention was warranted, to see that a fairness principle was imposed throughout this process. And I do think that it is up to the parole boards to make these decisions and not to the courts. But I do think that the court's involvement is necessary to make sure that the Parole Board and the Governor [are] playing by the rules.

— Hon. Miriam A. Vogel, Second District, Div. One

I remember the facts as being: neighboring properties had she-goats and a male goat, a billy goat.

PATRICIA MANOUKIAN:
Yes. Yes. The billy goat!
That's it.

WILLIAM WUNDERLICH:
And I think the females are called she-goats, or ewes. I don't know what they're called, but they're female goats. And it had been their habit and custom — these two adjoining neighbors — that when it was time for



Hon. William M.
Wunderlich

the she-goats to be bred, they would open a little hole in the fence so that the billy goat could get to the females. And this particular year, the owner of the billy goat had said he wasn't going to do that. "If you're going to If you want my billy goat, you have to come over and get him." And it was in the process of getting him and taking him back that the guy was injured. So one of his theories of liability was, if you had let me cut the hole in the fence as you always had in the past, we would never have had this problem So my question to them was, "Did you feel some risk in not cutting open the hole in the fence?" He says, "Oh, I'm not sure I understand what you're saying." I said, "Weren't you worried about making the billy goat gruff?" [laughs] So, bad humor!

PATRICIA MANOUKIAN: And that's my memory of that question also. And the rest of us were up there trying to control ourselves during the rest of the . . .

WILLIAM WUNDERLICH: Well, there are so few

PATRICIA MANOUKIAN: oral argument.

WILLIAM WUNDERLICH: . . . so few opportunities for humor at the appellate level. And I truly believe — I'm not trying to be, wax rhapsodic here or anything — I'm just saying I think there isn't a judge in this state that can survive — certainly at the trial level — without a very sophisticated and well-tuned sense of humor. And I've carried that into this courtroom. And of course up here in Yosemite you *have* to have a sense of humor to just survive, you know.

— *Hon. William M. Wunderlich, Sixth District*

★ ★ ★

JUDICIAL PHILOSOPHY

[Y]ou must not be ideologically stiff; you must be open-minded. I think that you should, to the very best of your ability, put out of your mind any preconceived ideas. It's impossible [to] do it, of course, really to when you get down to absolute bedrock. But you've got to do your best to be as close to neutral as you can as you review things



Hon. John G. Gabbert

I think that one of the most important things is also to try and make up your mind after you review everything, but do it within the limits

and not let things back up on you—and to decide the matter and then go ahead on other things. You have to do it; and sometimes it's awfully difficult, you know, and that's true in the trial courts too.

— *Hon. John G. Gabbert, Fourth District, Div. Two*

It's a very simple judicial philosophy. It's fairness, bottom-line fairness. If the court system is a system of laws, the rule of law has to prevail. There has to be a separation of the various powers here, the three main: legislative, judicial, executive. There has to be that separation, which has to stay in place.



Hon. Joan Dempsey Klein

— *Hon. Joan Dempsey Klein, Second District, Div. Three*

[M]y great-grandfather was a judge back in Illinois, and he wrote something at the end when he retired. I read that recently; I was very impressed with it.



Hon. Christopher C. Cottle

Basically what he focused on more than anything else was how important it was to our system to maintain the independence of the courts, to do everything we possibly can to get good people on the courts who are independent of however the wind is blowing at a particular time

— *Hon. Christopher C. Cottle, Sixth District*

I'm a firm believer in the separation of powers. I think that has to be . . . I would jealously guard that as best I could as a judge, even though I would disagree with the legislative opinion. If it's not subject to a constitutional attack, it's legally justified.

So I think my only review as a judge would be in whether or not it measures up to constitutional standards, not to second-guess the Legislature or try to modify it in some way by virtue of my own personal beliefs. So I guess you'd say that's a strict constructionist.

— *Hon. Robert F. Kane, First District, Div. Two*

[T]his is a society, ours, that's held together certainly not by race—we are incredibly diverse—not by religion, not even by language anymore. It's held together by the uncommon boast that we are a people; and it's a boast and a claim laid out in our constitutive law, the Constitution. It's a republic of a concept of ideas. And the job of attorneys is to work out that boast in very broad terms, very broad sweep sometimes, but equally important in the day-to-day matters of contracting, marrying, divorcing, adopting, forming and dissolving businesses. Those are the matters that one needs a lawyer in, because we are a nation of laws.

— Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Fourth District, Div. One



Hon. Daniel J. Kremer

I'm very concerned at the Supreme Court level with this debate that's going on as to whether or not you should humanize the judiciary. And I wouldn't want to be in a country where there wasn't an element of humanization of the judiciary. It doesn't mean that you're going to abort your knowledge of the law or your commitment to following the law. But the fact that you're human enough to say "Separate but equal isn't equal" is not a distortion of the law. And there's so many facets of our society that wouldn't make any advance at all if it weren't for judges that, first of all, recognize the problems, and then were willing to address them.

— Hon. Arleigh Woods, Second District, Div. Four



Hon. Arleigh Woods

I talked to our colleague now gone, Don Work, about that—who was just really the conscience of the court; he was a wonderful justice—and asked him what decisions he thought were important.


And he said, "It was important to remember that those decisions were supremely important to the people involved with them." It was very likely, very likely—unless it was a big corporate case—that that was one of the most significant events of the lives of the people who were involved in those cases and that any justice worth his or her salt had to keep that in mind. And I tried to

do that, remembering that the smallest property or family—certainly criminal—case was vitally important to the people handling it; so all of them were important in that sense.

— Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Fourth District, Div. One

[W]e're not at liberty, if there's a statute right on point, to refuse to apply the statute; so we do. But that doesn't prevent us railing against the statute and its effects, and urging the Legislature to change it. But no, we don't have the right to simply say, "Well, it may say this, but I'm not going to follow it."

— Hon. Timothy S. Buckley, Fifth District




Hon. Timothy S. Buckley

I never had a death penalty case, either as a lawyer or a judge. And I guess I consider that a blessing, because I don't know how that would have rubbed up against my faith on that. On the other hand, I think if judges take an oath to defend the Constitution and apply the law of the state, that's their job. And personal beliefs or concerns have to be set aside.

— Hon. Joanne C. Parrilli, First District, Div. Three

Never lose sight of the fact that the decision you're making is going to affect real human beings and real lives, and take it seriously. . . . [F]ind out what the law is and apply it to the facts of the particular case.

— Hon. James F. Thaxter, Fifth District



Hon. James F. Thaxter

[M]ore than anything I wanted to get it right in that case. . . . [I]t wasn't enough for people to feel like they had been treated fairly. . . . I wanted the right result to happen. . . . And so that was always very, very important. . . . [E]veryone that comes into my court has the same status. . . . in terms of the respect that they're warranted out of the box. So if it's a pro per, a homeless person, a police officer, a very prominent lawyer, I mean the homeless guy

is going to get respect from me just like the prominent lawyer. And then I'm going to try to get the right result for everybody. And so I think people appreciate that.

— *Hon. Candace D. Cooper, Second District, Div. Eight*

★ ★ ★

DECISION MAKING

You've got to carve up a case into its important parts and discard the rest of it, and then write about what's significant in an intelligent way so that when someone reads it, they know what the case is about and they know why you decided the way it is.

— *Hon. Charles S. Vogel, Second District, Div. Four*



Hon. Charles S. Vogel

[W]e had a wonderful, vigorous discussion amongst us, which was again something on the Court of Appeal I really loved. We had . . . if we were undecided on something or we had some differences, it was wonderful having those discussions. They were never heated; they were never ones where anybody walked away mad or wasn't talking. It was just a wonderful experience to engage in those kinds of discussions. I thought in many ways it was the best part of the job.

— *Hon. Donald B. King, First District, Div. Five*




Hon. Donald B. King

I didn't dissent that often, because I feel very strongly about dissents—not an ego trip—is there a way of working out the problem, is there another solution to the problem? I feel very strongly that dissents are . . . unless you feel very strongly, they shouldn't be there, because the party should think there is a unanimous decision by a court.

— *Hon. Howard B. Wiener, Fourth District, Div. One*

I enjoyed oral argument, and I found that oral argument really affected the way I voted on a number of cases and also affected the final product. . . . It's important that lawyers walk away from this process thinking that the judges really did understand their case.

— *Hon. Marcel B. Poché, First District, Div. Four*



Hon. Marcel B. Poché

[T]he chief talent of a good attorney is being a quick study—certainly a good appellate attorney, and it is very definitely the talent of a good judge, is to be a quick study. And so I tried to achieve that by going to the sources, learning what you have to learn, and learning from the lawyers who are in front of you.

— *Hon. Daniel J. Kremer, Fourth District, Div. One*

[T]he reason for writing a full dissent is because you're trying to persuade somebody up the line to — or, in some cases, future courts — to go the way you think is the proper way. And you can't do that in a paragraph. You've got to really lay it out, the full case. . . . And there's actually, in my view, more reason for someone to dissent if they're on an intermediate Court of Appeal like we are than if you are on a Supreme Court because a Supreme Court, your audience really is . . . only future Supreme Courts. But with us you've got the California Supreme Court that might be persuaded by your dissent. I had one year in which I wrote a bunch of dissents, but six of them were taken by the Supreme Court and they reversed the majority in all six of those cases.

LAURIE ZELON: Right. But were you ever writing for sister Courts of Appeal, because of course we're not bound by each other . . . and you might persuade another panel in another district or even in this district to see your point of view?

EARL JOHNSON: Yes, . . . [p]articularly when there's a kind of issue that's being written about all over the place, like whether trial courts had discretion to strike a strike. . . . I was writing dissents in those cases, saying that they should have discretion or did have discretion. And there was one other court up north that was . . . writing that way. All the rest were saying, "No discretion." And the California Supreme Court finally

took the case and they said there *was* discretion. . . . But I was aiming those at other Courts of Appeal. . . . [S]o yes, you do try to persuade whoever is persuadable.

— *Hon. Earl Johnson, Jr., Second District, Div. Seven*

★ ★ ★

DIVERSITY ISSUES

[W]ith the exception of two Ninth Circuit judges of Chinese ancestry, Thomas Tang and Hiram Fong of the Ninth Circuit, I may have been the only state appellate judge appointed at that time who was Chinese American. I don't know of anybody outside of Hawaii in the 50 states that had that position before me.

— *Hon. Elwood G. Lui, Second District, Div. Three*



*Hon. Elwood
G. Lui*

[A]t that time it was very difficult for people who belonged to minorities to get into the big law firms. There weren't any Hispanics, there weren't any blacks in the big firms or the middle firms. . . .

When I went to the DA's office, after, the DA called me in and said, "You're number one on the list; I'd like to appoint you, but I want to find out something. Are you going to have us spend a fortune training you to be a good trial lawyer and then leave us to go make money?" And I said, "I have to be honest with you, Mr. Roll," who was the DA. "I intend to stay three years and then make up my mind whether I want to make it a career or whether I do want to leave." And he said, "Thank you for an honest answer," and he hired me.

At the end of three years, I was so happy doing what I was doing that I decided to stay in public law, and I'm still in public law.

— *Hon. Arthur L. Alarcon, Second District, Div. Four*

Certainly what's been accomplished by the court in the past 100 years — from a very personal standpoint as a black woman — I am very conscious of the fact that the playing field has been evened very much over what it was 100 years ago. And the integration of the court — not only

the jurors, but the justices, the lawyers, and at every level of the court now you can look around and see someone who has a face like yours. And I think that means a great deal to the community in general. It means a great deal to the prestige of the court that we have accomplished this. And of course I also . . . from a personal standpoint, I am extremely pleased with the number of women that are on the bench and the quality of service that they're rendering. So on a very personal level, that's the first thing that comes to mind for me when I think of what's happened to the courts in the past 100 years.

— *Hon. Arleigh Woods, Second District, Div. Four*

And at the time that I was going to law school, there were less than 10 women in my law school class; so it was a very different type of environment than what I see with law students now. And so we even actually had, one of my professors . . . this is something you would never get away with now. He used to have what he'd call Ladies Day. He'd just come in and say, "It's Ladies Day," and he'd only call on the women that day. And so you just didn't know whether to, you know, run out of the classroom at that particular time. And I know that you would never get anywhere with doing that at this particular time.

— *Hon. Connie M. Callahan, Third District*



*Hon. Connie M.
Callahan*

Justice Klein discussing a case in which a male lawyer wanted to take control of the proceedings:

And I finally had to haul him up and say, "Listen, one more reference to the court as anything other than 'Your Honor' and you'll be held in contempt, because this is a court. It doesn't make any difference who is sitting here as a judge, but it's the court, and it has to have your respect."

— *Hon. Joan Dempsey Klein, Second District, Div. Three*

The quota system for the bar was three African-Americans in each bar. And I gave a speech, right after I'd been admitted, and I was at the Athletic Club, where they did not accept black members. But I was invited there as a speaker for some group — I don't remember exactly which. And I had no idea there was any press in the room. And in my remarks, I com-

mented on the fact that — I was being nasty, really — but I commented on the fact that it was a privilege to be in the Athletic Club because . . . the only way I could get in there was as a guest of someone else. And they were asking me about the bar, and I said, well, that the usual quota had been imposed, and there were three persons who had passed the bar but that I hoped that that was something that was going to be corrected in the future. . . . Well, it turned out it wound up on the front page of the *L.A. Times*. And the bar was denouncing me and my comments and the fact that it wasn't true. And the next bar, 15 black candidates passed.

— *Hon. Arleigh Woods, Second District, Div. Four*

I always felt, especially at the municipal court level as a trial lawyer in that era, that I had the advantage. I mean, it was so new to be a woman, the juries just were enthralled. And the judges at the municipal court level seemed to be very taken by having women in their courtrooms for the first time, and very respectful. When I got to superior court, some of the older judges, I think, took a dimmer view of it, but again, even with the juries, there was never a doubt. I felt that I had the advantage and the guys didn't know what to do with me. I mean, I weighed about 95 pounds in those days and they couldn't beat up on me like they would their male opponents, and so they were kind of fumbling around for how to handle this new person in the courtroom.

— *Hon. Joanne C. Parrilli, First District, Div. Three*

And then I was appointed as Presiding Justice to replace And I was a little concerned about Kingsley. And I remember going into his chambers — because I was told in advance what was going to happen — and I said, “It looks like I'm going to become PJ.” He says, “Oh, I think that's wonderful.” He says, “You know, the first words I learned in English were ‘yes, ma'am.’” And it was such a nice way for him to tell me . . . that it was perfectly all right.

— *Hon. Arleigh Woods, Second District, Div. Four*

★ ★ ★

ROLE OF THE APPELLATE COURT


The Courts of Appeal benefit the citizens of the state of California because we have to have a method for correcting error. And without in any way disparaging

the trial courts, you cannot have the largest trial court in the world and the most litigious society and not have error as a consequence in some cases.

— *Hon. Arleigh Woods, Second District, Div. Four*

And as a matter of fact, a great deal of the law in California is actually made by the Court of Appeal. If it's important and trend setting, the Supreme Court inevitably will pick up on it, and expand upon it, and speak to it. But initially, much of the law is made by the Court of Appeal.

— *Hon. Robert K. Puglia, Third District*



Hon. Robert K. Puglia

As I say, the Courts of Appeal are the backbone of the justice system in California, because without a system which afforded meaningful review, it wouldn't be much of a justice system. And that's the function and the office of the Court of Appeal.


— *Hon. Robert K. Puglia, Third District*

★ ★ ★

WORLD WAR II SERVICE

An experience common to nearly 25 percent of the Legacy interviewees was service in World War II. The three excerpts highlighted below are but a fraction of the compelling stories recounted by the justices.

Hon. Lynn D. Compton, portrayed in the book and television miniseries Band of Brothers; awarded the Silver Star, the Purple Heart, and a host of other medals and decorations:



Hon. Lynn D. Compton

PAUL TURNER: At the beginning of the book *Band of Brothers*, I'd like you to just give me a read on this:

“The men of Easy Company, 506 Parachute Infantry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division, U.S. Army, came from different backgrounds, different parts of the country. There were farmers and coal miners, mountain men and sons of the Deep South. Some were desperately poor, others from the middle class. One came from Harvard, one from Yale, a couple from UCLA. Only one was from the old Army, only a few came from the National Guard or the Reserves. They were citizen soldiers.”

[Does] that describe accurately what was going on, in your view?

LYNN COMPTON: Yeah, I’d say that’s pretty good; yeah, that’s . . . I mean, each thing is true, yeah. They ran the gamut and so forth.

Justice Compton describing his jump into Normandy:

PAUL TURNER: Where were you in the people coming out of the aircraft? Were you first, last, middle?

LYNN COMPTON: I was first. . . . [W]hen we went out the side of the C-47, we’re in the prop stream and we’re getting this prop blast. When your chute comes open, you get this tremendous jolt—opening shock, they call it. Well, because these guys weren’t, pilots weren’t, slowing down like they were supposed to, when I went out that door I got one hell of an opening shock; it was so bad that I had one of those cups on my helmet liner, my jaw flew open and broke the strap that was holding the helmet liner on. *[laughing]* My helmet stayed on, but the inside liner thing. . . . And that bag went off my leg like it wasn’t even strapped to it; it just went shhht, like that. And the rope was feeding out and burning my hand; I couldn’t hold it any longer, and I just let go and it snapped, and I haven’t seen it since, you know. . . .

When I hit the ground, I had a trench knife on my belt, a canteen, and some of those old D rations, those highly concentrated chocolate bars, in one of my pant legs. And that’s what I was sent to fight the war with: chocolate bars and a knife. *[laughing]*

Justice Compton describing preparations for the Battle of the Bulge:

PAUL TURNER: On the 15th of December 1944, the day before the Battle of the Bulge starts, what was your unit preparing to do?

LYNN COMPTON: We were preparing to have a football game at Rheims on Christmas Day, and I was coaching this team we had. I don’t know where the hell we got the uniforms; but anyway, we had uniforms and shoes and the whole bit, and we were getting ready to play a game against another unit—I forget what unit it was now—in Rheims called the Champagne Bowl or something. And we were out practicing in a field there outside the base in the morning, I remember, and word

came out that we were all to report to the headquarters, company headquarters, at noon or something like that.

Anyway, so practice broke up and we went back and got our gear together and went and reported to where we were supposed to report. They loaded us onto trucks, told us that there had been some kind of a breakthrough on the line someplace, and so that’s all we knew; we just headed out.

— *Hon. Lynn D. Compton, Second District, Div. Two*

Hon. M. O. Sabraw, on his experiences in Japan as a soldier during and after the War:

CARL ANDERSON: Okay. Do you recall where you were when the first atom bomb went off in Hiroshima?

M. O. SABRAW: My recollection is that we were on Okinawa at that point—and I know we were on Okinawa. And we actually had had a couple of jump exercises there, anticipating that we were heading for Japan, and later learned from operations material that that was the program: we and plus a large contingent was headed for southern Japan.

CARL ANDERSON: So what happened after the first atom bomb went off?

M. O. SABRAW: Well, the second atom bomb went off, and at that point we were with orders to go to Japan. And we didn’t know where we were headed; we just knew we were going to Japan. We were loaded with all our gear.


And we came to Atsugi airdrome, and we anticipated that we were going to jump on Atsugi airdrome; it’s an airdrome south of Yokohama 50 or 60 miles, something like that.

When we got there, the commanding general, General Swing, circled the airdrome and was suspicious that he didn’t see any activity there; so he sent a plane down to land, and the word came back that there appeared to be nobody there at the airdrome, that it had been abandoned at that time.

CARL ANDERSON: It was totally deserted?

M. O. SABRAW: Totally deserted. There was coffee on the tables, there was papers, there was supplies, there was everything, like somebody said, “Let’s exit now,” and that’s what happened.

— *Hon. M. O. Sabraw, First District, Div. Four*



Hon. M. O. Sabraw

Hon. Arthur L. Alarcon, describing his wartime leadership responsibilities at the age of 19; awarded the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star:

ARTHUR ALARCON: Well, I went overseas with the 94th Division, and we ended up near Germany near the Maginot Line, and we were part of the Bulge fighting in the Ardennes Forest battle.

And I was given a promotion by my captain from PFC to staff sergeant because of casualties; so at the age of 19, I had a group of 12 men under my care and responsibility.

Within a year I became the acting first sergeant of my company; then I had 200 people, and I had to be concerned about every aspect of their lives. So that forced me into a lot of maturity quickly.

JUDITH ASHMANN-GERST: I've always enjoyed talking to you about your World War II experiences. You had some just amazing events that occurred there. Is there anything you'd like to share with us?

ARTHUR ALARCON: Well, one thing that probably if you've talked to other former infantrymen or Marines, we don't usually talk about what happened on the battlefield. It's painful; I mean, we lost close friends.

I did have an interesting experience. I was a scout for my battalion, which meant I would go out in front whenever we'd go into a battle; and I was also the sniper, which meant that I stayed behind if we had to retreat. On one occasion the colonel of our battalion ordered me to go out into a valley, and it was covered with snow. And I said to him, "If I were the Germans, I would have a machine gun on the hill on the left and a machine gun on the hill on the right, and I would have crossfire where you're sending me." And he said, "I've given you a direct order; go for it."

I ran out, and sure enough, two machine guns started firing at me, and as I ran I could see the bullets between my legs, because they had bullets that you could . . . tracer bullets that you could see in the daytime.

I saw a large hole; it looked to be about a foot deep, looked like an old shell hole. I raced to that, jumped in it, and was covered with snow. And being a surfer from California, I had no idea about snow and ice.

What happened was, right under the snow was ice, and I cracked through that, and the machine gunners then lowered their guns; so the bullets were going right past my helmet, so I had to get down. And my captain, for whatever reason, choked. He didn't do anything to rescue me; he just sat there all day.

When it got dark, I was able to leave that place; but during that exposure, my legs were frozen up to my hips. The next day I was sent to a hospital in Luxembourg, and the doctor who treated me said, "I'm going to try some experiments with you, because we've had to amputate a lot of people, and I don't want to do that." He said, "Do

you drink?" And I said, "No." And he said, "Well, you're going to drink now," and he gave me an ounce of bourbon every hour for several hours and moved my bed over to the window and opened the window so that I wouldn't change my body temperature in a way that he didn't want. My legs were saved by this wonderful doctor.

When I came back, I went to the captain and I said, "You know that my legs were frozen under fire. Am I entitled to a Purple Heart? I don't want one if I'm not entitled to it." He said, "No, it has to be shellfire or fragments from a bomb or something." I said, "Okay."


About four years ago, I told this story to one of my granddaughters, who insisted I talk about it. I told her what happened, and she said, "That's not fair"—she was about 10 or 11 — "and you've got to do something." I said, "What do you want me to do?" She said, "I want you to write to the Secretary of the Army and tell him that you were cheated by that captain, and I want to see the letter."

I wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Army, and they wrote back to me — now, I was about 77 at the time — and they said, "We're about three years behind in checking this kind of a request." I wrote back and I said, "You know, I'm 77. I was in World War II, and three years from now I can't guarantee you that I'll be here if I'm entitled to it; but don't award me the medal if I'm not entitled." Well, they wrote back and said, "You were entitled to it." And I also found out that I had not ever been told I was entitled to the Bronze Star.

Three years ago, thanks to my granddaughter, I was awarded the Purple Heart — and it's right here — and the Bronze Star.

— *Hon. Arthur L. Alarcon, Second District, Div. Four*

HUGH ARTHUR EVANS: When I went over, I had to fly five missions as a copilot for a seasoned pilot so that you could see what it was all about and see how terrified you were going to be. The first time you see all that flak in the sky it's frightening as hell. And on my first mission the airplane on the right wing of the lead plane that we were flying on the left wing of had one of my classmates flying as the copilot, and I'd just looked over at him a minute ago or a minute before and looked away. I was watching where we were going, and I felt the airplane go up. They took a direct hit and the bomb bay just vaporized. So those kinds of things you had to get used to experiencing and seeing; and luckily, I didn't have any of those happen to me.



Hon. Hugh A. Evans

ARTHUR G. SCOTLAND: You actually got a special flying award, did you not?

HUGH ARTHUR EVANS: Yeah, I had a few, and I got the Distinguished Flying Cross in October. The citation says “Extraordinary Achievement,” and that’s really what it is. It takes a full set of brass ones, I’ll tell you, sometimes. And we had been on a mission over near Mersberg, outside of Berlin, and they knocked off two engines on one side. Luckily, we didn’t burn, and so I started dropping back as we got off the target, and let down and let them . . . finally flew that sucker all the way back across the channel and landed it at our base. I wasn’t sure I was going to make it, but we made it. So I think the survival was the extraordinary achievement.

ARTHUR G. SCOTLAND: How long were you flying in combat during the war?

HUGH ARTHUR EVANS: About from June until November, 35 missions. Some of the worst ones were the low-level stuff we did. We had to help the troops out in France; and there were three cities where they got bottled up and we’d go in at 10,000 feet. And the B-17’s a very slow aircraft, so we’d indicate 150 miles an hour — go plodding along and bomb on a smoke marker. In the meantime, the Germans would just crank their 88 Apache and bang, bang, bang. That would raise a very high pucker factor. *[laughing]*

ARTHUR G. SCOTLAND: No kidding.

HUGH ARTHUR EVANS: I’d come home with 100, 150 holes in the airplane, sometimes with an engine out. We only had to do that three times, and I was very thankful for that. *[laughing]*

ARTHUR G. SCOTLAND: Was there ever any sense of hesitation when you recall that — to fly on a mission?

HUGH ARTHUR EVANS: No. It was my turn to go, so we’d go.

England was a strange place to be flying out of where we were because I’ve . . . Maybe a year ago I looked at my old forum five and all the missions, and of the 35 takeoffs I made, I think 22 of them were on instruments — zero, zero. There was no, just no, visibility. And we had lights along the room where you could see, so you just set all your navigation needs for the headings you wanted, unset them, and then took off down the runway; and your copilot would watch and make sure you didn’t veer. And you watched your headings, and took off and climbed up through the stuff. Because it always broke in England in the afternoon and then would give you a ceiling of maybe 800 to 1,000 feet, and you could come in under it and get home. This is why in those days this was for young people — it wasn’t for old people. And I realized that more and more as I got older.

— Hon. Hugh A. Evans, Third District

PUTTING IT ALL IN PERSPECTIVE

George Brown was a grand man, probably the epitome of what and who a judge should be: intelligent, capable, gracious, thoughtful, wise. . . . He was sitting pro tem on the first panels that I was on as an appellate court justice and we tended to talk and then we had lunch. Anyway, after a few days during that first stint, he comes into my chambers after lunch. He said something to the effect,



Hon. Nickolas J. Dibiaso

“How do you like it? Are you enjoying it?” “Yeah,” I said, “it’s a little isolating and I’m still not getting used to this monastery that the Court of Appeal is.” He said, “Let me give you some advice.” He pointed me to the Cal.App. volumes of the official reports in my chambers; I still had them in those days. He said, “Pick one, about 100 years ago.” This was 1989, so I picked one about 1889 and I pulled that and he said, “Open it to a case.” “What case?” “Any case.”

So I opened it and we . . . found the first page. “What was the name of the judge on that case?”

“The justice?” I said. I don’t know, “Smith, John P. Smith.”

He said, “Do you know who John P. Smith was?” I said, “No.” “Do you think anybody today knows who John P. Smith was?” I said, “Unlikely, unless he’s got grandchildren.”

And he said, “Let that be a lesson to you. A hundred years from now nobody’s going to know who you were either.” I take that — that was a lesson in humility. And George was a humble man.

— Hon. Nickolas J. Dibiaso, Fifth District

I was in practice nine years, and one of the judges of that court was Judge Brownsberger. . . . I appeared in front of him a number of times. And one day . . . he said, “Chuck, do you want to be a judge? I’m retiring and they’ll appoint anyone I want.” Of course, this is before JNE. And I said, “Gee, I don’t know. What does it pay?” And he said, “\$42,500 a year.” I said, “That’s exactly what I made this last year. Let me think about that.” So I went and I spoke to Agee Shelton. I said, “Brownie’s leaving the court and he said he can get me appointed. What do you think?” He said, “Chuck, the good lawyers never become judges.” So I applied.

— Hon. Charles S. Vogel, Second District, Div. Four ★



2010 STUDENT WRITING COMPETITION WINNERS ANNOUNCED

First-place winner Sara Mayeux (CENTER) is congratulated by Chief Justice Ronald George (SECOND FROM LEFT), Associate Justice Kathryn Mickle Werdegar (LEFT), Society President David McFadden, and Board Member Selma Moidel Smith, who proposed and organized the competition — at the California Supreme Court, San Francisco, August 5, 2010.

PHOTO BY WILLIAM A. PORTER (THIS PHOTO AND CAPTION APPEARED IN THE LOS ANGELES AND SAN FRANCISCO EDITIONS OF THE DAILY JOURNAL ON OCTOBER 15, 2010.)

The California Supreme Court Historical Society is pleased to announce the winners of its 2010 Student Writing Competition. The three judges were unanimous in all of their choices.

First place was won by Sara Mayeux of Stanford University for “The Case of the Black-Gloved Rapist: Defining the Public Defender’s Role in the California Courts, 1913-1948.” She receives a prize of \$2,500 and publication in the 2010 volume of the Society’s annual journal, *California Legal History*. She is both a JD candidate at Stanford University School of Law and a PhD candidate in American history at Stanford University.

Second place was awarded to Joseph Makhluף, graduate student in history at California State University, Northridge, for “Jerry’s Judges and the Politics of the Death Penalty: 1977-1982.”



*Second-place winner
Joseph Makhluף*

The third place winner is Justin Dickerson, a JD student at Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, for “The Last of the Beaches: Development and Destruction of Palisades del Rey.”

The three distinguished judges were: Stephen A. Aron, Professor of History, UCLA; Ariela Gross, Professor of Law and History, USC School of Law; and Chris Waldrep, Professor of History, San Francisco State University.

Society President David McFadden points out, “The importance of the competition is that it encourages and rewards new scholarship in the ever-expanding field of California legal history.” The competition was open to law students and to graduate students in history, political science, government, and related fields. The winning papers are available on the Society’s website, www.cschs.org (at “History of the California Courts”). ★



*Third-place winner
Justin Dickerson*



California Supreme Court Holds 2010 Outreach Session in Fresno

The Supreme Court's outreach visit to Fresno on October 5–6, 2010, was the Court's first return visit to a judicial district since the inauguration of its annual outreach program in 2001. On the first visit to Fresno, in 2002, the Court traveled at the invitation of Presiding Justice James A. Ardaiz of the Fifth District Court of Appeal and, on this occasion, the Court's visit marked his retirement.

In the interim, the outreach program — designed to bring the work of the Supreme Court closer to the people and to interest local students in the judicial system — has seen continued growth. During the Court's one-day visit to Fresno in 2002, approximately 200 students took turns listening to oral arguments. This year, the Court's visit included two days of oral argument, and the student audience had grown to 300. In 2002, the justices answered prepared questions from ten high school students, and this year heard questions from fourteen.

The current visit also gave the Supreme Court an opportunity to participate in the growth of judicial administration in Fresno County. The Court heard oral argument for the first time in the Fifth District's award-winning new courthouse, completed in 2007.



TOP: Herbert I. Levy, associate justice of the Court of Appeal, prepares the students for oral argument. The fourteen student questioners are seated in the front two rows.

BOTTOM: The student visitors assemble in the courthouse lobby.

PHOTOS BY HOWARD K. WATKINS.

The justices also attended the dedication of the B. F. Sisk Courthouse of the Fresno County Superior Court, at which Chief Justice Ronald George joined in cutting the ceremonial ribbon.

A special event of the student outreach program was a twenty-minute press conference held by the Chief Justice for students from Bullard High School in Fresno. Nine students had the opportunity to sit at a conference table with the Chief Justice and pose impromptu questions about law and justice. ★



TOP: Dedicating the new B. F. Sisk Courthouse of the Fresno County Superior Court (LEFT TO RIGHT) — Tamara Beard, Court Executive Officer, Superior Court, Fresno County; Honorable M. Bruce Smith, Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Fresno County; Ronald Overholt, Chief Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, and Ronald M. George, Chief Justice of California.

BOTTOM: Chief Justice Ronald M. George (RIGHT) with Associate Justice Marvin R. Baxter (LEFT) and Society Past President James E. Shekoyan.

TOP: The new courthouse of the California Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District.

CENTER: The Supreme Court visits the Fifth Appellate District's new George M. Brown Courtroom — Chief Justice Ronald M. George (CENTER) with Associate Justices Joyce L. Kennard (LEFT), Marvin R. Baxter (RIGHT), and (STANDING, LEFT TO RIGHT) Carlos R. Moreno, Kathryn Mickle Werdegard, Ming W. Chin, and Carol A. Corrigan.

BOTTOM: Chief Justice Ronald M. George speaks at the reception.

A VIEW FROM THE BENCH

The Court was pleased to return to Fresno to celebrate the Fifth District Court of Appeal's beautiful new court facility and to be present for the dedication of the new Fresno County Superior Court building. Fifth District Court of Appeal Administrative Presiding Justice Ardaiz has been a strong supporter of the Supreme Court's outreach program, and the visit provided the Court an opportunity to acknowledge his support and to wish him well on his retirement. It was gratifying for the Court to experience the enthusiasm and attention of the students in attendance at the Court's oral argument session, and we were most appreciative of our gracious reception by the Fresno legal community.

— Associate Justice Kathryn Mickle Werdegard, California Supreme Court, and Society board member.

CALIFORNIA LEGAL HISTORY
VOLUME 5, 2010

JOURNAL OF THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT HISTORICAL SOCIETY




TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORAL HISTORY I

PHIL S. GIBSON,
CHIEF JUSTICE OF CALIFORNIA (1940–1964)

INTRODUCTION:

Joseph R. Grodin

ORAL HISTORY OF CHIEF JUSTICE
PHIL S. GIBSON

PHIL GIBSON: A CONVERSATION

Edward L. Lascher

REMEMBERING CHIEF JUSTICE GIBSON

Ellis Horvitz

ORAL HISTORY II

JUSTICE MILDRED LILLIE,
CALIFORNIA COURT OF APPEAL (1958–2002)

INTRODUCTION:

Earl Johnson, Jr.

ORAL HISTORY OF
JUSTICE MILDRED LILLIE

ORAL HISTORY REVISITED

JUSTICE JESSE W. CARTER:
GRANDFATHER AND ROLE MODEL

J. Scott Carter

A RETROSPECTIVE OF THE COMMITTEE ON
HISTORY OF LAW IN CALIFORNIA

ARTICLES

THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC DEFENDER:
ITS ORIGINS, EVOLUTION AND DECLINE

Laurence A. Benner

THE CASE OF THE BLACK-GLOVED RAPIST:
DEFINING THE PUBLIC DEFENDER'S ROLE IN
THE CALIFORNIA COURTS, 1913–1948

Sara Mayeux

THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT
AND THE FELONY MURDER RULE:
A SISYPHEAN CHALLENGE?

Miguel A. Méndez

CALIFORNIA'S ROLE IN THE MID-TWENTIETH
CENTURY CONTROVERSY OVER PAIN
AND SUFFERING DAMAGES: THE NACCA,
MELVIN BELLI, AND THE CRUSADE FOR "THE
ADEQUATE AWARD"

Philip L. Merkel

CALIFORNIA LEGAL HISTORY IN THE
HUNTINGTON LIBRARY: AN UPDATE

Peter L. Reich

BOOKS

WOMAN LAWYER: THE TRIALS OF CLARA
SHORTRIDGE FOLTZ

BARBARA BABCOCK

Review Essay by Mary Jane Mossman

RESISTING McCARTHYISM: TO SIGN
OR NOT TO SIGN CALIFORNIA'S LOYALTY OATH

BOB BLAUNER

Review Essay by Glen Gendzel

AFTER THE TAX REVOLT: CALIFORNIA'S
PROPOSITION 13 TURNS 30

JACK CITRIN AND ISAAC WILLIAM MARTIN

Review Essay by Daniel H. Lowenstein

RACIAL PROPOSITIONS: BALLOT INITIATIVES AND
THE MAKING OF POSTWAR CALIFORNIA

DANIEL MARTINEZ HOSANG

Review Essay by Ethan J. Leib

THE GREAT DISSENTS OF THE "LONE DISSENER":
JESSE W. CARTER'S TWENTY TUMULTUOUS YEARS
ON THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

DAVID B. OPPENHEIMER AND
ALLAN BROTSKY, EDITORS

Review Essay by Michael Traynor

A LEGAL HISTORY OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY:
AN ACCOUNT OF THE LOCAL BENCH AND BAR
THROUGH THE END OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

ALYCE E. PRUDDEN, EDITOR

Review Essay by Larry E. Burgess

HISTORY OF THE BENCH AND BAR OF
CALIFORNIA

OSCAR T. SHUCK, EDITOR

Review Essay by Charles F. McClain

WOMEN WHO KILL MEN: CALIFORNIA COURTS,
GENDER AND THE PRESS

GORDON MORRIS BAKKEN AND
BRENDA FARRINGTON

Review by Lawrence M. Friedman

TESTIMONIOS: EARLY CALIFORNIA THROUGH
THE EYES OF WOMEN, 1815–1848

ROSE MARIE BEEBE AND

ROBERT M. SENKEWICZ, EDITORS

Review by Gordon Morris Bakken

WATER IN THE WEST: THE COLORADO RIVER
COMPACT AND THE POLITICS OF WATER
IN THE WEST

NORRIS HUNDLEY, JR.

Review by Douglas R. Littlefield



Order through Hein!

Fill in your collection of

California Legal History

Subscription Information:

Membership in the Society is open to individuals at the rate of \$50 or more per year, which includes the journal as a member benefit. For individual membership, please visit www.cschs.org, or contact the Society at (800) 353-7357 or 4747 North First Street, Fresno, CA 93726.

Libraries may subscribe at the same rate through William S. Hein & Co. Please visit <http://www.wshein.com> or telephone (800) 828-7571.

Back issues are available to individuals and libraries through William S. Hein & Co. at <http://www.wshein.com> or (800) 828-7571.

**Please note that issues prior to 2006 were published as California Supreme Court Historical Society Yearbook. (4 vols., 1994 to 1998-1999).*

William S. Hein & Co., Inc.

1285 Main Street, Buffalo, New York 14209


Ph: 716.882.2600 ~ Toll-free: 1.800.828.7571 ~ Fax: 716.883.8100

E-mail: mail@wshein.com ~ Web site: www.wshein.com





DENNIS A. FISCHER has been named by *The Best Lawyers in America 2011* as “Best Lawyer of the Year” in appellate practice in Southern California. He has practiced for 45 years as a member of the bar primarily specializing in criminal appeals. He has argued 24 cases in the California Supreme Court (one in the U.S. Supreme Court), has more than 100 published opinions, and has served on numerous committees and task forces under Chief Justices Bird, Lucas, and George. Fischer is a fellow of the American Academy of Appellate Lawyers and past president of the California Academy of Appellate Lawyers. Fischer points with pride to the recent admission to the bar of his nephew Brandon, sworn in by Justice Robert Mallano while Fischer’s 93-year-old parents watched with pleasure.



ERIC H. JOSS and his firm, Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP, hosted a lecture on November 18, 2010, in their Los Angeles office by Columbia Law Professor, Jeffrey N. Gordon. Professor Gordon spoke on “The Dangers of Dodd-Frank in the Next Financial Crisis.” This lecture, an expansion of Columbia’s New York originated Dean’s program for alumni, was the kickoff event in the school’s Southern California alumni speaker series. Joss, a 1976 graduate of Columbia Law School, is a board member of the CSCHS and the chair of the board’s nominating committee.



HAROLD KAHN, San Francisco Superior Court judge since 2001, established his court’s asbestos case management department in January 2010. He notes that there are more personal injury and wrongful death asbestos exposure cases filed in San Francisco Superior Court than in any jurisdiction west of St. Louis. Judge Kahn is responsible for all pretrial matters — including law and motion,



discovery, settlement, trial setting, readiness and assignment — in every asbestos case venued in San Francisco.

During Judge Kahn’s tenure the backlog of asbestos cases that had previously been continued by the court due to unavailability of a courtroom was reduced from approximately 560 cases to zero. The number of cases that settled with the assistance of the court increased by over 600 percent and the number of jurors called to serve in asbestos cases was reduced by over 70 percent from the previous few years. Judge Kahn has a strong interest in California and San Francisco legal history. Among his resolutions for 2011 is to compile a list of 100 notorious cases tried in San Francisco’s trial courts over the last 160 years.


KRISTINE S. KNAPLUND, professor of law at Pepperdine University School of Law, was recently elected an Academic Fellow of the American College of Trust and Estate Counsel. Only two California law professors have previously been members. She also recently spoke at the Washington State Bar Estate Planning Seminar on “Post Mortem Conception and Its Effects on Estate Planning.” With thousands of cryopreserved embryos available and the technology to use them years after the biological parents’ deaths, she urged estate planners to consider how such a child might affect a client’s will or trust. Professor Knaplund is co-chair of the ABA Committee on Bioethics, and frequently speaks to bar associations on bioethics and wills issues.



As part of her research, she has read hundreds of probate files from the late 19th century in Los Angeles and St. Louis, to determine how women disposed of their property, and to investigate the prevalence of charitable bequests in the absence of an estate tax. Her most recent article is a historical examination of mortmain statutes, “Charity for the Death Tax? The Impact of Legislation on Charitable Bequests,” in *Gonzaga Law Review*. Professor Knaplund joined the faculty of Pepperdine University School of Law in 2002, where she teaches Property, Wills and Trusts, Advanced Wills and Trusts, and the Bioethics Seminar. She is a graduate of Oberlin College in Oberlin, Ohio, and the UC Davis School of Law. She is a board member of the CSCHS.



KENT RICHLAND argued the case of *City of Ontario v. Quon* in the United States Supreme Court in April 2010. It presented the issue of whether a government employer could, consistent with the Fourth Amendment, view messages sent by a government employee on a government-issued electronic device. It is the first case in which the Court has considered the interface of the Fourth Amendment with electronic communications. In June, the Court ruled unanimously in favor of his client, City of Ontario.




In September, the *Los Angeles Daily Journal* named Richland one of the top 100 lawyers in the State of California. Also in September, the United States Supreme Court granted his petition for certiorari in *Stern v. Marshall*, which he will be arguing early in 2011. Richland is a past president of the CSCHS.

JOHN SCHICK is currently a full-time faculty member at Humphreys College Laurence Drivon School of Law in Stockton. He assumed this position in 2008 after being an adjunct professor for over 30 years and a practicing criminal defense lawyer in the Stockton area for a similar period. He teaches criminal law and sales (article 2 of the UCC). During the last year, Schick was president of the King Hall (UC Davis School of Law) Alumni Association and in that position appeared in the school's informational video on the recent completion and dedication of a new addition to the 40-year-old building (www.youtube.com/UCDavisLaw).



Schick's work is the subject of a decision handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court in November of 2009. After the Ninth Circuit had reversed a death penalty case that he had tried in the 1980s, based on allegations that he had not presented enough evidence at the penalty trial, the high court, in a unanimous opinion, reversed that decision and mentioned Schick by name over 30 times in the opinion (see *Wong v. Belmontes* 558 U.S. ___ (2009)). And like all King Hall alumni, he is proud that the incoming chief justice of California is a King Hall graduate, Class of 1984. His interest in California Supreme Court history is sparked by the fact that his wife's great-great grandfather, John Sharpstein, was a justice from 1880 to 1892.

DAVID G. SILLS, presiding justice of the California Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three (Santa Ana), received the First Annual David G. Sills Award for Appellate Excellence from the Orange County Bar Association on October 4, 2010, in celebration of his 20th anniversary as presiding justice. Additionally, in December 2010, he was recognized by the Association of Certified Family Specialists for "writing the most thoughtful and practical opinions in family law appellate cases."



In his 20 years as presiding justice, he has overcome an inherited case backlog while accommodating a doubling in court volume. Through his efforts and leadership, the court was able to relocate to a new courthouse that was completed under budget after a 10-year struggle. The court now occupies a state-of-the-art, fiscally efficient facility with 21st-century design, which reduces operating costs and eliminates leasing costs.

Justice Sills was born in 1938 in Peoria, Illinois. He received his B.S. degree in political science in 1959 from Bradley University and his LL.B. in 1961 from the University of Illinois College of Law, where he was editor of the law school paper and National Moot Court Finalist. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1962 through 1965 and was admitted to the California bar in 1965.

His public service included three terms on the Irvine City Council, 1976-85, during which he served as mayor for four years. In 1985, Governor Deukmejian appointed him to the Orange County Superior Court and in 1990 elevated him to the Court of Appeal. He was reelected in 1986, 1998 and 2010. Justice Sills has written more than 2,000 opinions in matters ranging from election law and arbitration clauses to insurance law, DNA evidence, and surrogacy. Justice Sills does not accept the credit alone but attributes his success to the hard work of his colleagues and staff.


SELMA MOIDEL SMITH, lawyer and composer, was honored on July 15, 2010 with the performance of her suite for orchestra, *Espressivo*, at Walt Disney Concert Hall by the Los Angeles Lawyers Philharmonic, conducted by its founder, Gary S. Greene, Esq. (in photo). The concert was the Disney Hall





debut for the Lawyers Philharmonic, which consists of more than 75 lawyers and judges. Most recently, on September 16, Smith was recognized with the performance of the piano score of *Espressivo* as a "Musical Interlude" at the annual Installation of the Women Lawyers Association of Los Angeles (of which she is a past president) by outgoing president Helen B. Kim, who is also a Juilliard graduate. The event was held in the Crystal Ballroom of the Millennium Biltmore Hotel. Smith is a board member of the CSCHS.

MARK THOMAS, JR., retired judge of the Santa Clara County Superior Court, and a long-time member of the CSCHS, died on July 18, 2010, at the age of 80. He had a special interest in local legal history and was the author of several books, including histories of the San Benito County courts, the Santa Clara County Law Library, and his alma mater, Santa Clara University School of Law. He was also a co-author of *A Legal History of Santa Cruz County* (which is reviewed in the 2010 volume of *California Legal History*, the annual journal of the CSCHS).




Judge Thomas was appointed to the Sunnyvale Municipal Court in 1975 by Gov. Ronald Reagan and was elevated to the Santa Clara County Superior Court in 1983 by Gov. George Deukmejian, retiring in 1991. He was a past chair of the History Committee of the California Judges Association, which published *The Story of the California Judges Association: the first sixty years* (1992). He continued his historical activities throughout his lifetime.

CONNES THOMPSON and her moot court partner finished runner-up for the Bernard E. Witkin Award at the Roger J. Traynor California Moot Court 2010 Competition, held at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles. Rankings are determined by a team's combined score on a written brief and oral arguments. The tournament is named after the late Roger J. Traynor, who served on the California Supreme Court from 1940 to 1970, the last seven years as chief justice. The annual event is co-sponsored by the Witkin Legal Institute and Thomson West publishing.



Thompson is in her last year of law school at McGeorge School of Law, where she has been focusing her attention on appellate law. In addition to competing on McGeorge's Moot Court Team, she spent six months as an extern in the Honorable Peter Siggins's chambers in the First District Court of Appeal and a semester with the California Attorney General's Office in the Appeals and Writs Section. She will be one of eight students participating in McGeorge's Appellate Practice Clinic during the spring 2011 semester, representing appellants in dependency appeals. The clinic partners with the Central California Appellate Program (CCAP), which works with court-appointed counsel in the Third and Fifth District Courts of Appeal in criminal, juvenile, dependency and mental health appeals.

JOHN H. TIERNAN, judge of the Colusa County Superior Court, retired on June 25, 2010, after 18 years of service. His retirement was recognized by special resolution of the Colusa County Board of Supervisors. He served previously as the sole judge of the Justice and Municipal Court. As a Superior Court judge he served as presiding judge and helped to effect unification within the Colusa County court system. On a statewide basis, he served on the Trial Court Advisory Committee, the Presiding Judges Advisory Committee and the Traffic Advisory Committee, serving as chair of the Traffic Advisory Committee for four years.



Prior to being elected to the bench, he served the people of California as a deputy probation officer and a deputy district attorney in Butte and Siskiyou Counties as well as serving as chief deputy district attorney in Colusa County. He served our country in the U.S. Navy from 1961-70, including deployment off the coast of Cuba during the missile crisis and with the River Patrol Force during the Vietnam War. In addition he served in the California Army National Guard, being activated for a riot, flood and earthquake. He retired as a first sergeant. Judge Tiernan has served as faculty for the Traffic Adjudication Institute, facilitator for the Rural Judges Forum, and lecturer at Yuba College. As a non-commissioned officer, he taught a wide variety of subjects in the National Guard.

Judge Tiernan is married and has four daughters. He and his wife, Judy, plan on spending time with their family and taking lengthy vacations both in the United States and overseas. His leisure time will be interspersed with his continuing to serve in the assigned judges program. ★

MEMBERSHIP DONORS OCTOBER 1, 2009 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2010

SPONSOR LEVEL

\$500 to \$749

Douglas Littlefield, Ph.D.
Hon. Elwood Lui
Hon. Malcolm M. Lucas
Charles L. Swezey, Esq.

GRANTOR LEVEL

\$250 to \$499

Frederick D. Baker, Esq.
Prof. Gordon Morris Bakken
James Brosnahan, Esq.
Joyce Cook, Esq.
Hon. Betty B. Deal
Hon. Ronald M. George
Kevin Green, Esq.
Bradford Hughes, Esq.
Mitchell Keiter, Esq.
Ray E. McDevitt, Esq.
David L. McFadden
Joel McIntyre, Esq.
Hon. Richard M. Mosk
Kent Richland, Esq.
Kimberly Stewart, Esq.
Robert S. Warren, Esq.
Matthew Werdegar, Esq.

SUSTAINING LEVEL

\$100 to \$249

George Abele, Esq.
Phillip E. Allred, Esq.
Robert Arns, Esq.
Akram Adib Awad, Esq.
Hon. Marvin R. Baxter
Charles A. Bird, Esq.
Daniel Bromberg, Esq.
Odessa J. Broussard, Esq.
Hon. Richard F. Charvat
Hon. Ming Chin
Nicholas Cimino
Hon. Melvin E. Cohn
Thomas Henry Coleman, Esq.
Craig Corbitt, Esq.
Alan J. Crivaro, Esq.

Gerald F. Crump, Esq.
Richard D. DeLuce, Esq.
Hon. Norman L. Epstein
Jack I. Esensten, Esq.
Donald Falk, Esq.
Dennis A. Fischer, Esq.
Robert E. Fisher, Esq.
Charles F. Forbes, Esq.
John Gherini, Esq.
Dennis Grady, Esq.
Arthur W. Gray, Jr., Esq.
Howard Greenbaum, Esq.
Bernard Greenfield, Esq.
Hon. Ronald Grey
Hon. Joseph R. Grodin
Stephen A. Hamill, Esq.
Edward J. Horowitz, Esq.
Gary Marvin Israel, Esq.
Hon. James A. Jackman
Eric H. Joss, Esq.
Martha Kadue, Esq.
Hon. Harold E. Kahn
Donald E. Kelley, Jr., Esq.
Hon. Joyce Kennard
Jennifer L. King, Esq.
Manuel Klausner, Esq.
Prof. Kristine S. Knaplund
Charles Koro, Esq.
Catherine Kroger-Diamond, Esq.
Ruth Lavine, Esq.
Wilbur Littlefield, Esq.
Hon. James J. Marchiano
Thomas Marovich, Esq.
James C. Martin, Esq.
Hon. Carlos R. Moreno
Gene Noland, Esq.
Prof. David B. Oppenheimer
Sylvia Papadacos-Morafka, Esq.
Mark Perry, Esq.
Dean Drucilla Ramey
James Roethe, Esq.
George A. Skelton, Esq.

Kenneth H. Slimmer, Esq.
Prof. Karen R. Smith
Selma Moidel Smith, Esq.
Robert J. Stumpf, Esq.
John D. Taylor, Esq.
Howard Thelin, Esq.
Conness Thompson
Hon. John H. Tiernan
Roy G. Weatherup, Esq.
Hon. Kathryn M. Werdegar
Robert S. Wolfe, Esq.

JUDICIAL LEVEL

\$50 to \$99

Alameda County Law Library (Clara Lim)
Associated Historical Societies of Los Angeles County (Daniel T. Munoz)
California Court of Appeal Law Library – San Diego (Nanna Frye)
California Judicial Center Library (Frances M. Jones)
Los Angeles County Law Library (Marcia Koslov)
Riverside County Law Library (Sarah Eggleston)
UC Berkeley Law Library (Joaquin Clay)
UC Davis Mabie Law Library
UC San Diego Legal Research Center
Hon. Robert P. Aguilar
Larry Edward Anderson, Esq.
Peter A. Bertino, Esq.
Douglas Bordner, Esq.
John Briscoe, Esq.
Madeline Chun, Esq.
Harold Cohen, Esq.
Hon. John S. Cooper
Hon. Lee E. Cooper
Johnny Crowell, Esq.
Robert H. Darrow, Esq.
Jake Dear, Esq.

Jonathan English, Esq.
Larry Gomez, Esq.
Hon. Allan J. Goodman
Clayton Hall, Esq.
Hon. Richard M. Harris
Hon. Alan Hedegard
Seth Howard, Esq.
Hon. Steven J. Howell
Jack P. Hug, Esq.
David Jaroslawicz, Esq.
Hon. Thomas M. Jenkins
John J. Jones, Esq.
Richard Julien, Esq.
Patrick Kelly, Esq.
Andrew Kjos, Esq.
Charles Andrew Knell, Esq.
Matthew R. Leal, Esq.
Jordan D. Luttrell, Esq.
Kenneth Malamed, Esq.
Marjorie G. Mandanis, Esq.
Hon. William McKinstry
Steven Nissen, Esq.
Kathleen M. O’Dea, Esq.
Hon. Robert F. O’Neill
LeRoy Reaza
Prof. Peter Reich
Hon. Joel Rudolf
Prof. John C. Schick
John Seashore, Esq.
Janet Sherwood, Esq.
Hon. David Sills
David G. Sizemore, Esq.
Hon. Michael Stern
Gary L. Stryker, Esq.
Hon. Mark Thomas, Jr.
Kathleen Trachte, Esq.
Karl Uebel, Esq.
Hon. Brian R. Van Camp
Hon. Judith A. Vander Lans
Howard Watkins, Esq.
Harvey I. Wittenberg, Esq.
Rosalyn Zakheim, Esq.
Hon. Patrick J. Zika

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chair

David L. McFadden
President

Dan Grunfeld, Esq.
Vice President

Jennifer King, Esq.
Treasurer

Robert Wolfe, Esq.
Secretary

Ray E. McDevitt, Esq.
Immediate Past President

Selma Moidel Smith, Esq.
Publications Chair & Editor

Chris Stockton
Director of Administration

CSCHS
P.O. Box 1071
Fresno, CA 93714-1071

Phone (800) 353-7537
Fax (559) 227-1463
director@cschs.org



THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

Historical Society

2011 MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION/RENEWAL FORM

Please denote your membership level, make checks payable to CSCHS, and include your contact information below.

2011 members receive our annual journal, *California Legal History, Volume 6* and the CSCHS Newsletter, published twice yearly.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Benefactor ..\$2500 & above | <input type="checkbox"/> Grantor\$250 to \$499 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Founder\$1000 to \$2499 | <input type="checkbox"/> Sustaining ..\$100 to \$249 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Steward\$750 to \$999 | <input type="checkbox"/> Judicial.....\$50 to \$99 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sponsor.....\$500 to \$749 | |

Name _____ Professional Affiliation _____

Address _____ City _____

State _____ Zip _____ Phone _____ Fax _____

Email _____

Credit Card Number _____ Expiration Date _____ Donation Amount _____

Signature _____

Please sign up online at www.cschs.org, or return this form along with your membership contribution to:
The California Supreme Court Historical Society
P.O. Box 1071, Fresno, CA 93714-1071
Or send by fax to (559) 227-1463

New and renewing members may
pay their dues online at

WWW.CSCHS.ORG
