



THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

# Historical Society

NEWSLETTER · SPRING/SUMMER 2007

## Headnotes About the Reporters, 1850-1990

BY EDWARD W. JESSEN

*"Report me and my cause aright."*

HAMLET, ACT V, SCENE 2

From the California Constitution of 1849 to the present day, the Supreme Court has been required to decide causes in writing with the reasons stated.<sup>1</sup> The resulting written opinions become precedent to be followed by all other appellate and trial courts in California. But for opinions to be followed requires they be reported reliably and made available to all, and that has been the fundamental mission of every Reporter of Decisions.



Edward W. Jessen

Thus the Constitution of 1849 authorized the appointment of a Reporter of Decisions, charged with responsibility for preparing and publishing the opinions, subject to correction and approval by the court. To ensure availability of the opinions, the Legislature enacted, and has periodically amended, statutory provisions relating to the Reporter of Decisions and publication of the California Official Reports. These provisions were first enacted in the former Political Code, but are now found in the Government Code, section 68900 et seq. As a result, there have been 24 Reporters of Decisions to date:

1. So too has the Court of Appeal been required to decide causes in writing with reasons stated since its 1904 establishment, with the Reporter of Decisions also having responsibility for publishing the opinions of that court.

1. EDWARD NORTON	1850-1851
2. NATHANIEL BENNETT	1851-1852
3. RUFUS A. LOCKWOOD	1852
4. H.P. HEPBURN	1852-1854
5. WM. GOUVERNEUR MORRIS	1855
6. H. TOLER BOORAEM	1856-1858
7. HARVEY LEE	1858-1859
8. JOHN B. HARMON	1859-1860
9. DAVID T. BAGLEY	1860-1862
10. CURTIS J. HILLYER	1862-1863
11. CHARLES A. TUTTLE	1863-1867
12. J.E. HALE	1867-1869
13. TOD ROBINSON	1869
14. R. AUG. THOMPSON	1870-1871
15. CHARLES A. TUTTLE	1871-1878
16. G.J. CARPENTER	1878
17. GEORGE H. SMITH	1879-1882
18. W.W. COPE	1883-1887
19. C.P. POMEROY	1887-1917
20. RANDOLPH V. WHITING	1917-1940
21. B.E. WITKIN	1940-1949
22. WM. NANKERVIS, JR.	1949-1969
23. ROBERT E. FORMICHI	1969-1989
24. EDWARD W. JESSEN	1989-

The second Reporter of Decisions, Nathaniel Bennett, has the distinction of an overlapping tenure as an associate justice of the Supreme Court from December 1849 through October 1851. As the story goes, the first Reporter, Edward Norton (not the colorful Emperor Norton from San Francisco's early history), was overwhelmed by the work at hand and quit after his manuscript was lost in a fire. Justice Bennett agreed to take on the additional duties of Reporter and apparently did admirable work in both capacities, at least for a while.

In the preface to the first volume of Supreme Court opinions, Justice Bennett, as Reporter of Decisions, generally described

*Continued on page 5*

## Through Bernie's Binoculars

BY BERNARD E. WITKIN

EDITOR'S NOTE : BERNARD E. WITKIN, LEGAL "GURU" AND FORMER REPORTER OF DECISIONS, WAS TRULY WITHOUT PEER BOTH IN HIS LEGAL EDUCATION BOOKS AND OBSERVATIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S LEGAL SYSTEM. "BERNIE," AS HE WAS AFFECTIONATELY KNOWN BY ALL THOSE WHO LOVED AND RESPECTED HIM, GAVE THESE TONGUE-IN-CHEEK REMARKS ON APRIL 11, 1968 AT THE LAWYERS' CLUB OF SAN FRANCISCO'S ANNUAL LUNCHEON HONORING THE SEVEN JUSTICES OF THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT AT THE ST. FRANCIS HOTEL. THESE REMARKS REVEAL AS MUCH ABOUT BERNIE AS THE JUSTICES THAT HE DESCRIBED AND INTRODUCED.

Ten years ago, I stood on this same platform, charged with this same task. Of the court of that day, only two active members remain and naturally I'm a little older, but neither wiser nor reformed. As on that day, I say again: Who wants biography?

There are occasions when the air is blue with vital statistics: When a new appointee mounts the bench to have the halo affixed to his robe and when, full of years and honor, he graciously accepts the bounty of Government Code Section 75025 and becomes a retired justice sitting pro tem.

Today's jollification calls for neither inaugural nor valedictory and a collective capsule life history should suffice. So I quote from my unchallenged testimony given on April 18, 1958.

"These great men were born in log cabins, flats, furnished apartments, motel rooms—what does it matter? Of course, they were all poor boys and each, in his own way, stumbled into the law. With a little bit of luck, they passed the bar, met the governors, and became judges—this is the American way." As of now.

It remains only to cap this capsule biography with capsule characterizations of the entire court. The man from ATLA [American Trial Lawyers Association] offered us one just recently—"Showcase of the Nation." But I don't dig that. The key word connotes exhibitionism—a characteristic wholly lacking in our "Self-Effacing Seven." Perhaps "Round Table" would better describe this loose coalition of crusading knights-errant and mildly disapproving squires. Here, in this contemporaneous Camelot, under the wisdom and restraint of a latter-day King Arthur, a measure of unity is miraculously achieved.

It would be invidious to present them in order of seniority. Each, on his ascension, became ipso facto a judicial statesman possessed of all the learning and



Bernard E. Witkin

art and inspiration of his predecessors. Else why the express constitutional directive—one judge, one vote?

So, taking them at random, I come first to the man who wears no chain mail, but rides the whitest horse, carries the longest lance and hacks more evil giants to bits than any other knight of the Table. Hallucinating Indians, fortuitous bastards, sleepy welfare receivers, loose-mouthed interrogates, naïve insurers—to all of these rescuees and many more, he is a champion of champions.

To those in the law, he exhibits so many characteristics of other great jurists that one can scarcely enumerate them. Bold as Black, crafty as Cardozo, dogged as Douglas, flowery as Frankfurter, humble as Hughes, wild as Warren.

Indeed, to shift gears a bit, pontifical as Paladin.

Here is a knight without armor in salvageable land, roaming the jurisprudential jungle with bold heart and questing mind, carrying that card with the strange device: "Have opinion, need case."...

JUSTICE MATHEW O. TOBRINER.

If the Chief is the Court's King Arthur and Justice Tobriner its Paladin, surely the next man is its compact Paul Bunyan. His weapon is no broad sword or six-gun, but the monstrous axe of the fabled woodsman, which cleaves through legislative dogma and judicial precedent like a super-Schick through a hippie beard. The acknowledged master of appellate positivism, he is at his best when demonstrating, beyond any possible doubt, that the Court's majority is wholly, indisputably and knowingly wrong.

But this is not the Whole Man. Like all liberal reformers, he has his own streak of conservatism and his most celebrated exhibition of it has furnished judicial historians with the reason why Court of Appeal justices yearn for promotion to the Supreme Court. It is not the miniscule increase in emolument, not the easier workload, not even the exciting prospect of coping with three law secretaries instead of one.

It is because, as this justice held, Courts of Appeal have no jurisdiction to disregard controlling decisions of the Supreme Court, only the Supreme Court can freely disregard its own precedents. Breathes there an appellate justice who does not long for the day when he, too, can topple precedents?...

JUSTICE RAYMOND O. PETERS.

One look at the next man — that benign scholarly visage, instantly indicative of the Jesuit-trained philosopher, and you cry, “At last, a conservative!” But alas, you’re wrong.

Not so far out as Mathew, not so hard-lined as his namesake Raymond I, not so wide-ranging as the Chief, he is nevertheless the bloc’s solid fourth vote.

But conformity ends with that vote: His judicial product is individual and his opinions combine scholarship with judicial craftsmanship of the highest quality. And with it all, a gentle courtesy, constantly manifested when, with his facile pen, irreconcilable decisions are delicately reconciled and egregious judicial errors are urbanely transformed into mere differences of view on distinguishable facts.

He is the latest to join the Magnificent Seven and it gives me great pleasure to present the Court’s acknowledged expert on mathematical probability....

JUSTICE RAYMOND L. SULLIVAN.

Of our next judge, Sir William Schwenck Gilbert might have said,

*“He is the very embodiment  
Of everything that’s precedent  
He stands unmoved by any flaw  
Till he decides to change the law.”*

But nobody’s perfect. And on behalf of all conventional high court opinion writers and digest paragraphs and free-lance speculators in the judicial world, I ask:

“Where, sir, in your judicial product are those titillating recitals of fact, embracing the activities of each party and his privies at all discoverable periods? Where are the broad expositions of common law on tangential aspects of the case? Where are the lengthy extracts from the record, the quotations from learned writers quoting opinions quoting learned writers?

“Where are the footnotes that undermine the headnotes? And why only one abrupt answer to each vital question when reiteration would make it so much more authoritative?

“Judge, the pathway from your premise to your conclusion is as straight as Highway 101, but please, sir, just a silly kilometer longer?”

As you have guessed, I have all but introduced the Court’s only genuine lawman....

JUSTICE MARSHALL McCOMB.

What makes an ultraliberal Court look good? What highlights its fixed determination to fashion a legal world in the shape of its creators’ vision? What, without which, its innovations, its overrulings and its replacement of principles with policies, would go unnoticed



The California Supreme Court in April 1964 with all of the members that Bernie Witkin talks about in his address.

From left to right, front row: Marshall F. McComb, Roger Traynor and Raymond Peters.

From left to right, back row: Louis H. Burke, Mathew O. Tobriner, Stanley Mosk and Raymond E. Sullivan.

except by Harvard Law Review and the reasonable facsimiles thereof?

Why, the conservative minority anchored to the proven past and working present. That minority, in its effort to preserve the jurisprudential pattern, actually furthers the revolution by emboldening those whose assaults on the status quo are exposed but not contained. In California's Court, that minority is composed of two well-known figures. The first you have already met.

The second is a judicial progressive whose name has been prominently connected with the national movement for reform of court administration. His current obsession is a Deplorable Dichotomy: California's trial courts are a marvel of business efficiency with judicial manpower fully utilized and congestion a mere distasteful memory. But the reviewing courts? Why not maximize their effort and minimize their opinion content?

And so, as he pursues his Grail mounted on a slow horse, we greet the Knight of the Impossible Dream....

JUSTICE LOUIS H. BURKE.

The next man is an enigma. Is he for or against the status quo and which? Is he a new or an old New Dealer? Why does he one day cuddle with the Chief and another day huddle with Burke? Is he a cautious liberal or a daring mugwump?

The superior craftsmanship and persuasive style of this intransigent causes acute anguish in the bloc. And residents in the vicinity of 3494 Jackson have heard, in the still of the night, spectral tenor of Mathew, crooning in his Blooming boy:

*"Can't you hear me yellin'  
Your vote should be jellin'"*

*Not just hanging on the vine;  
Stanley, Baby, won't you make up your mind  
to be mine?"*

Yes, that's our uncommitted Knight....

JUSTICE STANLEY MOSK.

The last man is the head of our knightly order. His decisions cover the vast panorama of the law—substantive, procedural, civil and criminal. He gave us strict product liability, additur, tenant power, legislative precedents, sophisticated appellate review, collateral estoppel by a stranger and, as you know, he raised *Cahan*. A collection of his opinions would almost serve as a working encyclopedia of modern law.

Yet this is not the Whole Man. An appellate opinion, inexorably confined to the justiciable issues raised by the parties to an adversary proceeding, is a restricted vehicle for the reshaping of broad areas of the law. And our Chief Justice, realizing this more acutely than any other high court judge, has supplemented his daytime product with truly magnificent moonlighting.

His many addresses—delivered at strategic places throughout the land and reproduced in legal publications—have made a permanent record of the Traynor philosophy and the Traynor concept of the appellate process.

These immense deposits of legal treasure are not for this day alone. Succeeding generations will find in them the inspiration and the form and content of innumerable reforms in the law. The justice of Traynor will far outlive Traynor, the Justice.

It is with great pride that I present to you the Once and Future Judge...

CHIEF JUSTICE ROGER J. TRAYNOR.

---

---

B E C O M E   A   C S C H S   M E M B E R



T O D A Y



Your membership supports the mission of the society to recover, preserve, and promote the legal and judicial history of the state of California. This income provides for publications, programs, projects and grants.

All members receive the CSCHS Newsletter and invitations to society-sponsored receptions and events.

Judicial level or higher additionally receive as a membership benefit *California Legal History*—the Society's scholarly journal (formerly the *CSCHS Yearbook*)—and other publications offered by the Society.

EMAIL US AT [DIRECTOR@CSCHS.ORG](mailto:DIRECTOR@CSCHS.ORG) OR CALL US AT (818) 781-6008

---

---

---

---

## Headnotes About the Reporters, 1850–1990

Continued from page 1

the statutory authorization for reporting opinions, and he also noted two important principles of California jurisprudence that have never changed: “By another statute, the decisions of the court, in *all* cases were required to be given in writing, and, by another statute, *all* decisions were required to be reported.” (1 Cal., at p. vii; see now Cal. Const., art. VI, § 14; Gov. Code, § 68902.)

But there were problems actually publishing the Supreme Court’s opinions in the first decade or so of statehood and there were also problems publishing statutes and legislative journals. In 1852, the Senate’s committee on printing reported that \$256,000 had been spent that year—more than the entire cost of state government for a year for several southern states at the time—but only two volumes of statutes and two volumes of legislative journals had been printed. So in 1861, Governor John Downey urged that proper provision be made for printing the Supreme Court’s opinions and in 1862 the California Constitution was amended to require that the Legislature provide for the prompt publication of such opinions of the Supreme Court as the court deemed expedient—a requirement that has been a cornerstone of California appellate jurisprudence for the subsequent 144 years. (See now Cal. Const., art. VI, § 14.)

Not much is known about the Supreme Court’s third through sixth Reporters of Decisions, but the tenure of the seventh, Harvey Lee, was eventful and, perhaps, typical of the rough-and-ready nature of the late 1850’s in California. This story has been told before but never better than by Jake Dear, the Supreme Court’s Chief Supervising Attorney and history maven, at a special session commemorating the court’s 150th anniversary:<sup>2</sup>

“Unlike his predecessors, Lee was appointed not by the court, but by the Legislature. The court was not very happy with this new arrangement, and there was some concern that Lee was not up to the job. Justice Steven Field later commented that Lee’s work was so defective that the judges sought to have the new law repealed and the appointing authority returned to the court. A former dean of Boalt Hall School of Law picked up the story in a 1926 article:

---

2. February 8, 2000, Sacramento, reported at 35 Cal.4th 1262, 1266-1267, and also available on the society’s Web site at [http://www.cschs.org/02\\_history/02\\_e.html](http://www.cschs.org/02_history/02_e.html). In turn, the special session quotes a 1926 article by Orrin Kip McMurray entitled “Historical Sketch of the Supreme Court of California,” in *Contemporary Review of Bench and Bar in California*.

“This [led] to a bitter feeling on [Lee’s] part toward the judges, and in a conversation with Mr. Fairfax, the clerk of the court, [Lee] gave vent to it in violent rage. Fairfax resented the attack, an altercation ensued, and Lee, who carried a sword cane, drew his sword and ran it into Fairfax’s body, inflicting a serious wound in the chest just above the heart. A second wound, not so serious as the first, followed, and Fairfax drew his pistol as Lee raised his sword for a third thrust.

“[Fairfax] was about to shoot [in self-defense], but, restrained by the thought of Lee’s wife and children, let the pistol drop.’ Evidently, this was widely circulated news, and it was said that ‘All California rang with the story of this heroic act.’”

With regard to the work of the court and the reporting of opinions in that era, Charles A. Tuttle, the 11th reporter, wrote an introduction to 24 Cal. that includes an abstract of the Supreme Court’s work and its opinions prior to the 1862 restructuring of the court (and state government in general) by constitutional amendment. Tuttle framed his abstract in terms of the “old court” and the “new court” with candid statements as to why restructuring was needed. The opinions of the “new court” first appeared in 24 Cal., preceded by Tuttle’s introduction.

Tuttle noted that the court’s workload in the early years was “not large,” and the three justices then constituting the Supreme Court were able “with ease, to dispatch its business.” As a result, all the opinions decided through 1856 were published in just six volumes.

But in years subsequent to the Gold Rush, emigrants to California began making it their permanent home, which spawned an increase in litigation and changed the types of cases the Supreme Court had to decide. The legal principles were frequently intricate and novel and thus the court, as originally organized, was “unable to dispose of the cases brought before it with the celerity which, particularly in new communities, is desirable.” (24 Cal. at p. iii.) The strain of the workload is perhaps evident in the 17 volumes of opinions for the seven years ending in 1863, compared to the six volumes between 1850 and 1856.

Further insight into Supreme Court jurisprudence of the day, and a prescient forecast, was also part of Tuttle’s introduction to the opinions of the “new court”:

“California being the first State organized . . . out of the territory acquired from Mexico, upon its Judiciary devolves the labor of settling and establishing many important principles not before discussed in English

or American Courts. Our reports on such questions will undoubtedly be the precedent by which the young Territories and States now growing up will be guided. The present volume contains many important adjudications upon questions of this character, and also in relation to corporations, real estate titles, and constitutional law. . . . A report of the decisions rendered during the year 1864 will fill three more volumes. It is my intention to give those volumes to the profession with all possible dispatch—if possible, before the close of the present year. The questions



*This page from the Official Reports reflects the appointment of C.P. Pomeroy taking effect on May 19, 1888. Pomeroy is the longest serving Reporter of Decisions. His 30-year term lasted until his death on March 4, 1917.*

COURTESY CALIFORNIA STATE ARCHIVES

settled in the present and forthcoming volumes will go far to quiet that feverish anxiety which is always attendant upon uncertainty as to the rights of property, and will give to the legal profession landmarks which will enable it to avoid much of the litigation which has unavoidably resulted from the former unsettled state of affairs in California.”

An interesting historical sidebar of late 19th century official law reporting in California is the emergence of a second version of the Official California Reports for opinions decided in the first half-century or so of statehood. While the contents and accuracy of the reprinted version are above reproach, the second version has internal opinion pagination that differs slightly from the original version.

The second reprinted version of the Official Reports, which is reportedly still on the shelves in various law libraries, is the editorial product of Robert Desty, a nationally renowned legal editor of that era who was a treatise writer, digest editor, and case law compiler. At that time, commercial publishers nationwide were finding opportunity and profit in reprinting older and hard to find state reports, and the Desty version of the Official Reports is a product of this reprinting movement to satisfy demand for the early volumes of reports.

At the turn of the 20th century, C.P. Pomeroy was roughly at the midpoint of his 30-year tenure as Reporter of Decisions from 1887 to 1917. That makes Pomeroy the longest serving Reporter of Decisions, and

it means that the Supreme Court did not appoint its first 20th century Reporter, Randolph V. Whiting, until 1917, following Whiting’s two-year apprenticeship under Pomeroy.

To Pomeroy fell the responsibility of establishing the Official California Appellate Reports for opinions of the Court of Appeal on its establishment in 1904. By 1917, Pomeroy had reported 102 volumes of Supreme Court opinions, and an additional 33 volumes of Court of Appeal opinions starting with that court’s first decisions in May 1905. Thus Pomeroy averaged 3.4 volumes per year of Supreme Court opinions, and about three additional volumes per year for the Court of Appeal for the years he

reported that court’s opinions, too.

But Whiting, during his 23-year run, published 210 volumes—148 volumes of Supreme Court opinions and 62 volumes for Court of Appeal opinions. Thus Whiting averaged approximately nine volumes per year. The point is how the increasing volume of appellate opinions reflected growth in general for California and its judicial system between the late 19th century and World War II.<sup>3</sup>

This brings us to the court’s 21st and most illustrious, Reporter of Decisions, Bernard E. Witkin, who served from 1940 to 1949. Although Witkin is, of course, better known for his other accomplishments as a legal scholar, editor of treatises, promoter of continuing education of judges, and counselor for more than a generation to the judicial branch, he also reformed how the Reporter’s office operated by conceiving and

3. This comparison also reflects the growing increase in the annual number of appellate opinions over the years. Concerns over this growth and the impact it was having on the bench and bar eventually led, in 1964, to implementation of selective publication of Court of Appeal opinions. Up to 1964, every Court of Appeal opinion was reported; since that time, only those Court of Appeal opinions meeting criteria specified by the California Rules of Court are officially reported.

implementing the system still used today to promptly and efficiently publish California opinions with the accuracy and enhancements necessary for the bench, bar, and public to make reliable use of the state's decisional law. It may not be coincidental that Phil Gibson was Chief Justice at the time Witkin implemented his system, but Gibson's role, if any, is unknown and the anecdotal credit has always been given entirely to Witkin.

Until the early 1940's, all aspects of preparing, editing, and enhancing opinions for publication were done by the Reporter of Decisions and staff. This was the universal way that opinions were officially published in every jurisdiction providing for appropriate dissemination of the decisional law. In California, and many other states, the actual printing was done under contract, but in other jurisdictions the state printing office was utilized.

The chronic problem created by this system—and not just in California, where Witkin's solution kept the problem in check—was lack of publishing currentness. Against an increasing volume of opinions being filed at irregular rates throughout the year, staffing, which in the best of circumstances would be gauged for an average of the volume, could not keep pace with the demand for currentness in times of heavy filings, yet left staff idle when filings were few in number.

So Witkin's concept for maintaining currentness and editorial quality against an irregular but ever-increasing rate of opinion filings was to forge a partnership with a private sector legal publisher having a large and experienced editorial department. That turned out to be the former Bancroft-Whitney Co., which by then was already the longtime publisher of the Official Reports, but not previously involved with the editorial work.<sup>4</sup> The concept had Bancroft-Whitney's staff, under the general supervision of the Reporter of Decisions, performing contractually defined styling, citechecking, and enhancement for opinions to be published in the Official Reports, subject to painstaking review and approval by the Reporter of Decisions and the authoring justices before opinions were regarded as "final" and printed for posterity in the bound volumes.

The great virtue of this system for at least a couple of generations was that a good portion of Bancroft-Whitney's staff was trained and capable of working on

the Official Reports when the rate of opinion filings was heavy, but many could be deployed on less time-critical publications like jurisprudences, form books, and practice guides when filings were lighter. Thus Witkin established a public-private editorial partnership that is still today the cornerstone of how the Official Reports are produced, and it has ensured currentness and editorial quality in the Official Reports for over 60 years and many dramatic changes affecting how opinions are reported and published. In the early 1940's, for example, the annual average was about 10 volumes per year, and all opinions filed by the Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal were published. By the late 1960's, the annual average was 15 volumes per year, and by the late 1970's, despite implementation of selection publication for Court of Appeal opinions, which resulted in only a modest percentage being included in the Official Reports, the annual average was back up to 15 volumes per year.

In 1942, ancillary to the editorial reforms, Witkin issued the first California Style Manual, stating in the preface that it was intended "to state the chief rules and practices which govern the preparation, form and publication of opinions of the appellate courts of California. It is designed primarily as a guide for the courts, the Reporter of Decisions and the publishers of the official California Reports and advance sheets. It is believed, however, that law offices and law publishers and printers may find it useful in their work." Obliquely connecting the style manual to the editorial reforms occurring at that time, Witkin went on to advise that the manual "was produced as speedily as possible to meet the imperative need for standardization of these practices." The first edition contained seven chapters in 104 pages, and it was sold for \$1.50 by the state "Printing Division Documents Section."

Another historical sidebar is that Bernard Witkin was the first Reporter of Decisions to have his name omitted from the spine of the volumes he reported. Up to that time, the California Official Reports was a "nominative reporter," meaning the name of the reporter was attributed on the spine of each volume. The trend over time has been to eliminate the nominative feature of official reports, but a few states, including New York, continue the practice today.

A consequential aspect of eliminating nominative reporters was that it symbolized that the judges, not reporters, had become primarily responsible for the content of the opinions. In post-Colonial times, and apparently also in the early statehood days of California, reporters sat through the oral arguments taking notes, then consulted with the judges and examined the records to actually write the opinions. Gradually through the 19th century, starting with Georgia in 1841, judges were required to write their opinions.

4. Bancroft-Whitney was the Official Reports publisher for so long, both before and after the Witkin editorial reforms that no court records providing the inception date have ever been found. At the time Bancroft-Whitney's corporate successor-in-interest ceased being the official publisher, a San Francisco law librarian did some research and opined for a San Francisco legal tabloid that Bancroft-Whitney had been the official publisher for 105 years.

After Witkin left the Supreme Court in 1949 to devote full effort to writing his treatises, William Nankervis was appointed Reporter of Decisions and served in that capacity for 20 years, publishing 218 volumes of Supreme Court and Court of Appeal opinions and closing the second series for both the California Reports and the California Appellate Reports. Nankervis thus joined the 20th century Reporters of Decisions, except, ironically, Witkin, in serving lengthy tenures. In addition to serving 20 years as Reporter of Decisions, however, Mr. Nankervis, as he is affectionately known in the office even today, was also the assistant reporter between 1930 and 1940, and 1942 and 1949.



Robert E. Formichi

Nankervis also wrote a revised edition of the California Style Manual in 1961, noting in the preface that “[t]his manual has been out of print for a long time, and the frequent calls for copies have indicated a need for a new edition.”

But the real contribution Nankervis made to the Supreme Court may run much deeper and for much longer than his 20 years as Reporter of Decisions. Including his 17 years as Assistant Reporter of decisions, Nankervis devoted 37 years of service to the Supreme Court. In the preface to the 1942 style manual, Witkin acknowledged that the major portion of the research “was done by my colleague, Wm. Nankervis, Jr., and his long experience as Assistant Reporter of Decisions has also made possible the detailed statement of the unwritten practices of this office.”

In addition, Witkin’s biography assigns 1941 to 1943 as the time he spent writing the rules on appeal. Although impossible to now document, it is perhaps reasonable to speculate that Nankervis’s experience up to that point may have freed up a considerable part of the time Witkin likely required for drafting the appellate rules.

Maintaining symmetry with Nankervis’s tenure, the 23rd Reporter of Decisions, Robert E. Formichi served the court for 20 years between 1969 and 1989, overseeing publication of most of the third series of the Official California Reports and the Official California Appellate Reports (259 volumes). Prior to being elevated to Reporter of Decisions, Formichi worked under Nankervis in the Reporter’s office and before that in the Clerk’s office.

Formichi was also responsible for two significant revisions of the California Style Manual, the first a modest revision of Nankervis’s 1961 version, and a second

significant revision that was published in 1986 as the third edition. This continued the hope expressed by Witkin in the 1942 that “from time to time the work may be revised and improved.”

In an interview reported at the time of his retirement in 1989, Formichi described the Reporter’s work as “a quiet, backstage practice,”<sup>5</sup> noting, however, that the opinions were “documents of the state, documents of the people, and tools of society. They must be quality.” In the same article, Justice Stanley Mosk described Formichi’s work as “indispensable to the court process.”

This points out that responsibilities encompassed within official law reporting are now largely taken

for granted. As far back as 1912, one writer derisively noted the reporter no longer sat in court, listening to oral argument, and making his own notes. Rather, the reporter received the opinion of the court and merely used “scissors and paste” to make volumes of the reports, as contrasted to the arduous work required of the nominative reporters of years earlier, who actually wrote the opinions. Today, appellate justices are appropriately assigned credit for the opinions attributed to them and the editorial process of publishing opinions<sup>6</sup>—either in the traditional paper-based reporter or in computer-based forms—seems automatic to the bench, bar, and public. Overlooked in a process that seems so automatic is the largely anonymous work of reporters throughout the Supreme Court’s history to make suggestions for clarity and accuracy before opinions are filed, then ensuring that opinions are accurately reported within a body of decisional law that is accurate, functional, and accessible for the bench and bar. In a sense, being forgotten has always been the highest of praise for California’s Reporters of Decisions.

*Edward W. Jessen is a past president of the Association of Reporters of Judicial Decisions and has been California’s Reporter of Decisions since 1989.*

5. In the same article, Witkin noted that, “the reporter of decisions is a forgotten man.”

6. That is, enhancing the opinions with summaries and headnotes, adding parallel citations, ensuring the accuracy of all quotations and citations, and conforming opinions to style requirements.





JUSTICE KATHRYN MICKLE WERDEGAR participated in mid-March as a judge in the Hale Moot Court Honors Program competition's final round at the University of Southern California's Gould School of Law. In February, she delivered a speech at Hastings College of the Law in connection with the Hastings Women's Law Journal Symposium "Envisioning Equal Opportunity: The Realities of Discrimination, Prejudice and Bias."



For the past three years, Werdegar served as Chair of the Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Rules for Publication of Court of Appeal Opinions whose work resulted in the extensive amendment of California Rules of Court, rule 8.1105 (publication of appellate opinions), which was approved by the Supreme Court and became effective April 1, 2007.

JUDGE WILLIAM A. MCKINSTRY, a former member of the Board of Directors of CSCHS, retired last year from the Superior Court of Alameda County. He sits on assignment and was just appointed to the Assigned Judges Advisory Committee.



Judge McKinstry recently addressed the Fall Symposium of the Conference of California Historical Societies and argued that Alameda County was created in 1853 to attract and control the western terminus of the transcontinental railroad.

PROFESSOR GORDON MORRIS BAKKEN of California State University, Fullerton's Department of History, recently published *Encyclopedia of Immigration and Migration in the American West*, two volumes, co-edited with Alexandra Kindell (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Reference, 2006) and *World History: A Concise Thematic Analysis*, two volumes, co-authored with



Steven Wallech, Touraj Daryee, Craig Hendricks, Anne Lynne Negus, and Peter Wan (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2007).

LOS ANGELES LAWYER REX S. HEINKE, head of the national appellate and litigation strategy group for Akins, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, has been elected to membership in the American Law Institute, a prominent group of judges, lawyer and teachers which publishes restatements of basic legal subjects and proposes changes in the law. Membership is by invitation only and limited to 3,000.



LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE MICHAEL JOHNSON was selected in September as 2006 Judge of the Year by the Constitutional Rights Foundation, receiving the Justice James A. Cobey Award. The award recognized Judge Johnson for his longstanding work with high school students in the foundation's mock trial competition and summer internship program.

Los Angeles lawyers KENT L. RICHLAND and DAN GRUNFELD were among the 43 lawyers honored with the 2007 California Lawyer Attorneys of the Year (CLAY) award by the editors of *California Lawyer* magazine. Richland, a partner with Greines, Martin, Stein & Richland, was named for his work in the area of probate law with his representation of Anna Nicole Smith before the U.S. Supreme Court case. Grunfeld, president and CEO of Public Counsel, was named for his work on a class action that restored benefits to developmentally disabled children, in leading an investigation to prevent hospitals from dumping





patients on Los Angeles' skid row, and responding to the legal needs of thousands of evacuees who had come to Los Angeles in the wake of Hurricane Katrina.

Board Member SELMA MOIDEL SMITH has been honored by the National Association of Women Lawyers which has established the annual Selma Moidel Smith Law Student Writing Competition. Its purpose is to encourage and reward original law student writing on issues concerning women and the law. The author receives a cash prize, and the winning entry is published in the NAWL Women Lawyers Journal. NAWL, founded in 1899, is the oldest national organization of women lawyers.



GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY has concluded its third annual speaker series honoring Justice Jesse Carter, a Golden Gate graduate who served on the California Supreme Court from 1939-1959. The September 2006 series featured four lectures on the topic of "The Independence of the Judiciary." The lecturers were Michael Traynor, president of the American Law Institute; Christopher Sallon, a London barrister, Timothy Simon, Governor Schwarzenegger's appointments secretary, and Judge Marsha Berzon of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Los Angeles lawyer SAM ABDULAZIZ, senior partner at Abdulaziz, Grossbart & Rudman, was presented in February with the Robert B. Flaig award by the Los Angeles County Bar Association for excellence in the practice of construction law. Abdulaziz is only the fifth attorney to receive this honor. He was introduced by his personal friend and colleague, Kirk MacDonald, senior partner at Gill and Baldwin.

## *The Tough Streets of San Francisco*

Mike McKee, who covers the California Supreme Court for *The Recorder* legal newspaper, relates the tale of a skateboarder who cut across the sidewalk path of California Chief Justice Ronald M. George in mid-March.

George was walking with Jake Dear, the court's chief supervising attorney, from the court's headquarters to Opera Plaza Sushi to celebrate George's birthday and that of a staff member. Suddenly, the two of them were nearly run down by a young man on a skateboard at the corner of Golden Gate Avenue and Polk Street.

George called out sternly, "No apology, I guess!" The chastened skateboarder replied politely, "Excuse me, sir. I'm sorry."

Dear, who confirmed McKee's eyewitness account, added a related tidbit of his own. About 20 years ago, on the same Civic Center corner, Dear put out his arm and prevented Justice Joseph R. Grodin from walking into the path of a car that had run a red light. Grodin and Dear were discussing a complex property-rights case when the car whizzed by.

According to Dear, Grodin "didn't skip a beat in his discourse and never knew that I'd saved him from being run over. Such was, and remains, his level of concentration."



## LET US HEAR FROM YOU

REACH A NEW MILESTONE? RECEIVE A PROMOTION, AWARD OR HONOR?  
READ A GREAT BOOK?

Send contributions for MEMBER NEWS and suggestions for ON YOUR BOOKSHELF to:  
[director@cschs.org](mailto:director@cschs.org), (818)781-6009 (fax) or CSCHS, 6946 Van Nuys Blvd., Suite 202, Van Nuys, CA 91405.

# MEMBERSHIP DONORS 2006

## FOUNDER LEVEL

**\$1000 to \$2499**

Marshall Grossman, Esq.  
John Donovan, Esq.  
Jerome Falk, Esq.  
Jones Day

## PATRON LEVEL

**\$500 to \$749**

Munger Tolles Foundation

## SPONSOR LEVEL

**\$500 to \$749**

Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Esq.  
Douglas R. Young, Esq.  
Charles L. Swezey, Esq.  
Hon. Howard B. Wiener

## GRANTOR LEVEL

**\$250 to \$499**

Frederick D. Baker, Esq.  
Prof. Gordon Morris Bakken  
James Brosnahan, Esq.  
Michael Case, Esq.  
Joyce Cook, Esq.  
Vicki DeGoff, Esq.  
Feris M. Greenberger, Esq.  
Richard Grosboll, Esq.  
Hanson, Bridgett, Marcos,  
Vlahos & Rudy, LLP  
Ellis J. Horvitz, Esq.  
Hon. Earl Johnson, Jr.  
Jennifer L. King, Esq.  
John T. Knox, Esq.  
Hon. Quentin L. Kopp  
Hon. Malcolm Lucas  
Hon. Elwood Lui  
Bruce E. Maclin, Esq.  
Thomas J. McDermott, Esq.  
Ray E. McDevitt, Esq.  
Mr. David L. McFadden  
Joel F. McIntyre, Esq.  
David L. Mulliken, Esq.  
Ronald L. Olson, Esq.  
Hon. Charles B. Renfrew  
Edward S. Renwick, Esq.  
Kent L. Richland, Esq.  
Francis O. Scarpulla, Esq.  
James Shekoyan, Esq.  
John. K. Smith, Esq.  
Kimberly Stewart, Esq.  
Robert S. Warren, Esq.  
Hon. Kathryn Werdegarr

## SUSTAINING LEVEL

**\$100 to \$249**

Mr. John A. Arguelles  
Hon. Orville A. Armstrong

Ms. Ophelia Basgal  
Hon. Marvin R. Baxter  
Charles A. Bird, Esq.  
Odessa J. Broussard, Esq.  
Mr. John Burns  
Jan Chatten-Brown, Esq.  
Hon. Ming Chin  
Richard R. Clements, Esq.  
Hon. Melvin E. Cohn, Ret.  
Alan J. Crivaro, Esq.  
Richard D. De Luce, Esq.  
Hon. George M. Dell, Ret.  
Judge Frank Domenichini, Ret.  
Paul J. Dubow, Esq.  
Hon. Mark L. Eaton, Ret.  
Todd Elliott, Esq.  
Hon. Norman L. Epstein  
Jack I. Esensten, Esq.  
Donald M. Falk, Esq.  
Dennis A. Fischer, Esq.  
Charles F. Forbes, Esq.  
Hon. Ronald M. George  
Arthur W. Gray, Esq.  
Daniel Grunfeld, Esq.  
John Hanft, Esq.  
Hon. Joseph B. Harvey, Ret.  
Edward J. Horowitz, Esq.  
Robert Hughes, Esq.  
Eric H. Joss, Esq.  
Hon. Harold E. Kahn  
Stephen Kaus, Esq.  
Robert E. Kayyem, Esq.  
Hon. Joyce Kennard  
Kenneth Kofman, Esq.  
Theodore A. Kolb, Esq.  
Wendy C. Lascher, Esq.  
Hon. James Marchiano  
James Martin, Esq.  
Prof. Charles McClain  
Hon. William McKinstry, Ret.  
Harold O. McNeil, Esq.  
Hon. John J. Merrick, Ret.  
Grover D. Merritt, Esq.  
Alexander R. Moore, Esq.  
Hon. Wendell Mortimer, Jr.  
Mrs. Stanley Mosk  
Hon. Richard M. Mosk  
Hon. Leslie Nichols  
Kevin O'Connell, Esq.  
Mr. Frederick K. Ohlrich  
Prof. David B. Oppenheimer  
Hon. Edward A. Panelli, Ret.  
Thomas M. Peterson, Ret.  
Forrest Plant, Esq.  
Hon. Elwood Rich  
Jacob T. Risner, Esq.  
James N. Roethe, Esq.  
Prof. Harry Scheiber


Hon. Ramona G. See  
Hon. Henry W. Shatford, Ret.  
Professor Karen Smith  
Selma Moidel Smith, Esq.  
Hon. Michael L. Stern  
Hon. Ronald Stovitz  
Robert J. Stumpf, Jr., Esq.  
Mark J. Sullivan, Esq.  
Gerald L. Tahajian, Esq.  
Hon. Mark Thomas, Jr., Ret.  
Prof. Gerald F. Uelman  
Sandra F. Wagner, Esq.  
Hon. Madge Watai  
Howard K. Watkins, Esq.  
Roy G. Weatherup, Esq.  
Michael J. Weaver, Esq.  
Robert H. Zeller, Esq.  
Hon. Patrick J. Zika

## JUDICIAL LEVEL

**\$50 to \$99**

Hon. Herbert Adden  
Hon. Robert P. Aguilar, Ret.  
S.R. Ambrose, Esq.  
Mrs. Laura Aram  
Joseph M. Baim, Esq.  
Hon. Patricia Bamattre-  
Manoukian  
Hon. Edwin F. Beach  
Ms. Marcia R. Bell  
Peter J. Belton, Esq.  
Hon. Gail B. Bereola  
Peter A. Bertino, Esq.  
Hon. and Mrs. William  
Beverly, Jr.  
Hon. Arthur S. Block, Ret.  
Boalt Law School  
Elayne Breslaw, Esq.  
Hon. Carol S. Brosnahan  
Keith A. Broussard, Esq.  
Hon. Gerard S. Brown  
Hon. Zel Canter, Ret.  
Owen J. Clements, Esq.  
Harold Cohen, Esq.  
Guy B. Colburn, Esq.  
Hon. J. Hilary Cook  
Hon. Lee E. Cooper, Jr. Ret.  
Clifford D. Crowder, Esq.  
Gerald F. Crump, Esq.  
Michael O. Daniels, Esq.  
Jake Dear, Esq.  
Susan J. Diamondstone, Esq.  
Ms. Nanna Frye  
Ms. Tracey E. George  
Hon. Jack Goertzen, Ret.  
Hon. Allan J. Goodman  
Hon. Ronald L. Grey  
Hon. Joseph R. Grodin  
Hon. William C. Harrison  
Hon. Alan H. Hedegard  
Bradley D. Heinz, Esq.  
Hon. Patricia Herron, Ret.  
Hon. Francis Hourigan  
Hon. Steven J. Howell  
Hon. Thomas M. Jenkins, Ret.  
Fran Jones, Esq.  
Justice Robert F. Kane, Ret.  
Hon. Haig Kehiayan  
Webster Kinnaird, Esq.  
Sidney Knable, Esq.  
Ms. Marcia Koslov  
Germaine K. LaBerge, Esq.  
Kenneth W. Larson, Esq.  
Pepperdine Law Library  
John H. Lejniaks, Esq.  
Levin, Esq.  
Ms. Clara Lim  
Jordon D. Luttrell, Esq.  
Timothy V. Magill, Esq.  
Daniel W. Martin, Esq.  
Hon. Richard J. McAdams  
Frederick N. Merkin, Esq.  
Robert L. Mezzetti, Esq.  
Hon. Carlos Moreno  
Mr. Daniel T. Munoz  
Anthony Murray, Esq.  
Steven A. Nissen, Esq.  
Hon. Robert H. O'Brien, Ret.  
Hon. Robert F. O'Neill  
Morgan Prickett, Esq.  
Patricia Smith Ramsey, Esq.  
Peter Reich, Esq.  
Jeanne P. Robinson, Esq.  
Wilford H. Ross, Esq.  
Hon. Joel Rudof, Ret.  
Harvey A. Schneider, Esq.  
Jeremiah R. Scott, Esq.  
George A. Skelton, Esq.  
Kenneth H. Slimmer, Esq.  
Hon. Peter S. Smith, Ret.  
John V. Stevens, Esq.  
Hon. Paul Teilh  
Hon. John H. Tiernan  
Jaak Treiman, Esq.  
Hon. Brian R. Van Camp  
Hon. John P. Vander Feer  
Hon. Judith A. Vander Lans  
Ms. Gayle E. Webb  
Helen E. Williams, Esq.  
Carrie R. Wilson, Esq.  
Mrs. Alba Witkin  
Robert S. Wolfe, Esq.  
Paul Wyler, Esq.  
Oliver B. Wyman, Esq.  
Rosalyn S. Zakheim, Esq.

*The CSCHS apologizes to any member who may have been accidentally excluded or classified incorrectly.*



**CALIFORNIA  
BENCH BAR  
BIANNUAL  
CONFERENCE**

Mark your calendars for  
**SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 29<sup>TH</sup> AT 2:15 P.M.**

We look forward to seeing you in Anaheim at the  
2007 Bench Bar Biannual Conference, a joint meeting of the State Bar,  
California Judges Association and Judicial Council!

THE SOCIETY'S 2007 PANEL PROGRAM:

**"PERSPECTIVE ON JUDICIAL ELECTIONS: THEN AND NOW"**

Featuring retired Judge Roger Warren, past president of the National Center for State Courts; Professor Lawrence M. Friedman of Stanford University School of Law; Professor Martin Shapiro of UC-Berkeley Boalt Hall; Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Terry B. Friedman; and former California Supreme Court Justice Joseph R. Grodin of Hastings College of the Law examining the history and development of contested elections for the state Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal and Superior Courts of California.

Hon. Ronald M. George  
*Chair*

Ray E. McDevitt  
*President*

David L. McFadden  
*Vice President*

Ophelia B. Basgal  
*Treasurer*

Joyce Cook  
*Secretary*

James E. Shekoyan  
*Immediate Past President*

James J. Yoppolo  
*Director of Operations, Finance & Administration*

Philip R. Carrizosa  
*Director of Programs & Publications*

CSCHS  
6946 Van Nuys Blvd. Ste. 202  
Van Nuys, CA 91405

Phone (818)781-6008  
Fax (818)781-6009  
[director@cschs.org](mailto:director@cschs.org)



THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

*Historical Society*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Headnotes About the Reporters, 1850-1990</i>	<i>Member News</i> . . . . .	9
Edward W. Jessen . . . . .		1
<i>Through Bernie's Binoculars</i>	<i>The Tough Streets of San Francisco</i> . . . . .	10
Bernard E. Witkin . . . . .	<i>Membership Donors 2006</i> . . . . .	11