AMENDMENT TO THE CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT Adopted by the Judicial Council on November 19, 2021, effective January 1, 2022

1	Emergency rule 3. Use of technology for remote appearances	2
2	Standard 10.20. Court's duty to prohibit prevent bias	3
3		

1			Appendix I			
2		Emergency Rules Related to COVID-19				
3	ė i					
4	Eme	ergenc	ey rule 3. Use of technology for remote appearances			
5 6	(a)	Rem	Remote appearances			
7	(4)	14011	tote uppeurunces			
8		Notv	withstanding any other law, in order to protect the health and safety of the			
9		public, including court users, both in custody and out of custody defendants,				
10		witnesses, court personnel, judicial officers, and others, courts must conduct				
11		judic	eial criminal proceedings and court operations as follows:			
12						
13		(1)	Courts may require that judicial criminal proceedings and court operations be			
14			conducted remotely.			
15						
16		(2)	In criminal proceedings, courts must receive the consent of the defendant to			
17			conduct the proceeding remotely and otherwise comply with emergency rule			
18			5. Notwithstanding Penal Code sections 865 and 977 or any other law, the			
19			court may conduct any criminal proceeding remotely. As used in this rule,			
20			"consent of the defendant" means that the consent of the defendant is			
21 22			required only for the waiver of the defendant's appearance as provided in emergency rule 5. For good cause shown, the court may require any witness			
23			to personally appear in a particular proceeding.			
24			to personally appear in a particular proceeding.			
25		(3)	Conducting <u>criminal</u> proceedings remotely includes, but is not limited to, the			
26		(3)	use of video, audio, and telephonic means for remote appearances; the			
27			electronic exchange and authentication of documentary evidence; e-filing and			
28			e-service; the use of remote interpreting; and the use of remote reporting and			
29			electronic recording to make the official record of an action or proceeding.			
30						
31		(Sub	d (a) amended effective January 1, 2022.)			
32						
33	(b)	Suns	set of rule			
34						
35		This rule will remain in effect until 90 days after the Governor declares that the				
36			of emergency related to the COVID-19 pandemic is lifted, or until amended or			
37		repea	aled by the Judicial Council.			
38	_					
39	Eme	rgency	Rule 3 amended effective January 1, 2022.			
40	,	1				
41	• •		amended effective November 13, 2020; adopted effective April 6, 2020; previously			
42	amer	ıded ef	fective April 17, 2020, April 20, 2020, June 20, 2020, and August 13, 2020.			

(a) General Statement of purpose

The California judicial branch is committed to ensuring the integrity and impartiality of the judicial system and to court interactions free of bias and the appearance of bias. Consistent with this commitment, each court should work within its community to improve dialogue and engagement with members of various cultures, backgrounds, and groups to learn, understand, and appreciate the unique qualities and needs of each group.

(Subd (a) amended effective January 1, 2022; previously amended effective January 1, 1994, January 1, 1998, and January 1, 2007.)

(b) Duty to ensure integrity and impartiality of the judicial system

Each court, its judicial officers, and its employees have the duty to preserve ensure the integrity and impartiality of the judicial system, each judge should:

(1) Ensure fairness

Ensure that courtroom proceedings are conducted in a manner that is fair and impartial to all of the participants.

(2)(1)Refrain from and prohibit prevent biased conduct

In all eourtroom proceedings court interactions, each court, its judicial officers, and its employees should refrain from engaging in conduct and prohibit should take action to prevent others from engaging in conduct that exhibits bias, including but not limited to bias based on age, ancestry, color, ethnicity, disability, gender, gender expression, gender identity, genetic information, marital status, medical condition, military or veteran status, national origin, physical or mental disability, political affiliation, race, religion, sex, ethnicity, and sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and any other classification protected by federal or state law, including Government Code section 12940(a) and Code of Judicial Ethics, canon 3(B)(5), whether that bias is directed toward counsel, court personnel staff, witnesses, parties, jurors, or any other participants person. The court, judicial officers, and court employees may consider such classifications only if necessary or relevant to the proper exercise of their adjudicatory or administrative functions.

(2) Ensure fairness

1 2 3		-	dicial officer should ensure that courtroom interactions are conducted nner that is fair and impartial to all persons.
4 5	(3)	Ensure	unbiased decisions
6 7		_	dicial officer should ensure that all orders, rulings, and decisions are n the sound exercise of judicial discretion and the balancing of
8			ing rights and interests and are not influenced by stereotypes or
9		biases.	
10			
11	(Sub	d (b) adop	ted effective January 1, 2022.)
12			
13	(b)(c) Crea	tion of lo	cal or regional committees on bias
14			
15	Eacl	court sh	ould establish a local committee with local bar associations to assist
16	in m	aintaining	g a courtroom environment free of bias or the appearance of bias.
17	Cou	ts within	one or more counties may choose to form a single committee. To
18	assis	<u>t in provi</u>	ding court interactions free of bias and the appearance of bias, courts
19	shou	ld collabo	orate with local bar associations to establish a local or regional
20	com	mittee. Ti	rial courts may choose to form a regional committee. Appellate courts
21	-		o form separate or joint appellate court committees or join a trial court
22			regional committee formed by or composed of trial courts within the
23	appe	llate cour	ts' districts. The local Each committee should:
24			
25	(1)		posed of representative members of the court community, including
26			limited to judges judicial officers, lawyers, court administrators, and
27		_	ntative and individuals who interact with the court and reflect and
28			nt the diverse and various needs and viewpoints of court users-from
29		-	y, women's, and gay and lesbian bar associations and from
30		organiza	ations that represent persons with disabilities;
31	(=)	_	
32	(2)	-	or support educational programs designed to eliminate unconscious
33		-	<u>licit</u> biases within the court and legal communities, including but not
34			to bias based on disability, gender, race, religion, ethnicity, and
35			prientation; and. Education is critical to developing an awareness of
36		_	ins of bias and the impact of bias on individuals, culture, and society.
37		Educati	on should include:
38		(A) T	
39			formation as to bias based on the protected classifications listed in
40		<u>(b</u>	0)(1);
41		(D) I	Compared to the second to the
42			formation regarding how unconscious and explicit biases based on
43		<u>th</u>	ese classifications develop, how to recognize unconscious and

1 2			explicit biases, and how to address and eliminate unconscious and explicit biases; and
3			- •
4		(C)	Other topics on bias relevant to the local community informed by the
5		~ /	committee's independent assessment of the unique educational needs in
6			that community.
7			
8	(3)	Deve	elop and maintain an informal procedure for receiving complaints
9	()		ing to bias in the courtroom, including but not limited to bias based on
10			bility, gender, race, religion, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. Engage in
11			lar outreach to the local community to learn about issues of importance
12		_	ourt users. Specifically, committee members should be encouraged to:
13			•
14		(A)	Inform local community groups regarding the committee's activities;
15			and
16			
17		<u>(B)</u>	Seek information from the local community regarding concerns as to
18			bias in court interactions and how the court can address those concerns.
19			
20	(Suba	l (c) ar	mended and relettered effective Janaury 1, 2022; adopted as Subd (b) effective
21	Janua	ary 1,	1994; previously amended effective January 1, 1998, and January 1, 2007.)
22			
23			
24	(c)(d) Mini	mum	components of a complaint procedure Providing information regarding
25	comp	olaint	<u>procedures</u>
26			
27			al complaint procedure developed and maintained by a local committee
28	on bi	as sho	ould:
29			
30	(1)		tain a provision specifying that the intent of the procedure is to educate
31			the purpose of ameliorating the problem rather than disciplining the
32		perso	on who is the subject of the complaint;
33	(0)		
34	(2)	Acce	ommodate local needs and allow for local flexibility;
35	(2)		
36	(3)	App	ly to all participants in courtroom proceedings;
37	(4)	A 1	to anterta comunicate and a societate describinations of the second second
38	(4)		ly only to complaints as to which the identity of the complainant is
39		knov	vn;
40	(5)	Т . 41	as systems assisted and values disclosure is as spined by large and the
41	(5)		he extent possible and unless disclosure is required by law, protect the
42			identiality of the complainant, the person who is the subject of the
43		com	plaint, and other interested persons;

42

1 2 3 4		The existence of the local committee, <u>and</u> its purpose, <u>and the features of the informal complaint procedure</u> should be memorialized in the applicable local rules of court.
5 6 7		(Subd (e) amended and relettered effective January 1, 2022; adopted as Subd (d) effective January 1, 1994; previously amended effective January 1, 2007.)
8 9	<u>(f)</u>	<u>Implementation</u>
10 11 12		All courts should implement the recommendations of this standard as soon as possible.
13 14		(Subd (f) adopted effective January 1, 2022.)
15 16 17 18	previ	dard 10.20 amended effective January 1, 2022; adopted as sec. 1 effective January 1, 1987; ously amended effective January 1, 1994, and January 1, 1998; amended and renumbered tive January 1, 2007.
19 20		Advisory Committee Comment
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30	The visubdistake: approand is prohisopen and freecog	livision (b). An earlier version of this standard referred to the "court's duty to prohibit bias." word "prohibit" has been replaced with "prevent" in the title of the standard and in vision (b), such that the standard now asks courts, judicial officers, and court employees to actions to prevent bias rather than prohibit bias. This change reflects a more comprehensive each in how courts are to combat bias, focusing on understanding the many forms, causes, impacts of bias rather than simply forbidding it. Preventing bias may include, for example, biting bias; encouraging judicial officers, employees, and court users to report bias; being to discussing and learning from real misunderstandings and instances of unconscious bias; occusing on robust education regarding how unconscious and explicit biases develop, how to enize them, and how to address and eliminate bias.
31 32 33 34 35 36 37	Judic without befor 3(B)(and f	udicial officer duties stated in this subdivision are consistent with the California Code of ial Ethics, which addresses judicial officer responsibilities for performing judicial duties but bias, prejudice, or harassment (canon 3(B)(5)); for requiring attorneys in proceedings the the judicial officer to refrain from manifesting bias, prejudice, or harassment (canon 6)); for discharging judicial administrative duties without bias or prejudice (canon 3(C)(1)); for requiring staff and court personnel under the judicial officer's control to refrain from festing bias, prejudice, or harassment in the performance of their duties (canon 3(C)(3)).
38 39 40 41 42	proce defin expan	earlier version of this standard applied solely to judges and referred to "courtroom redings." "Judge" has been expanded to "judicial officers," which includes all judges as ed by California Rules of Court, rule 1.6, and all appellate and Supreme Court justices. The ended phrase broadly covers any judge, justice, subordinate judicial officer, or temporary who might conduct a courtroom proceeding. Additionally, in subdivision (b)(1),

- 1 "courtroom proceedings" has been changed to "court interactions" to expand the scope of
- 2 proceedings and actions covered by this standard to include not only proceedings occurring in
- 3 courtrooms but also interactions in other areas of the court, including in the clerk's office and at
- 4 public counters.
- 5 Subdivision (d). An earlier version of this standard encouraged local bias committees to create
- 6 informal complaint procedures for court users and members of the public to submit complaints
- 7 regarding bias in court proceedings. The recommendation that local bias committees create
- 8 informal complaint procedures has been eliminated in large part because of the many existing and
- 9 updated avenues for making complaints regarding bias in court interactions, and to avoid creating
- 10 conflicts between those procedures. For example, the authority and procedures for addressing
- 11 complaints concerning judicial officers and subordinate judicial officers are outlined in rules
- 12 10.603 and 10.703 of the California Rules of Court and canon 3(D) of the California Code of
- Judicial Ethics. Similarly, rules 10.351 and 10.610 of the California Rules of Court, as well as
- 14 Government Code section 71650 et seq., include authority and complaint resolution processes for
- 15 addressing complaints against court employees. In practice, courts have developed robust
- 16 procedures for addressing such complaints against judicial officers, subordinate judicial officers,
- and court employees, and the Commission on Judicial Performance provides detailed information
- on its website at *cjp.ca.gov* about how to file complaints and the procedures it employs for
- 19 addressing such complaints.
- 20 In addition to the concerns regarding duplicative and conflicting complaint procedures, the
- 21 recommendation that local bias committees adopt informal complaint procedures created
- additional concerns. For example, the earlier version of the standard envisioned using informal
- 23 complaint procedures to resolve incidents that do not warrant formal discipline; however, it is
- often difficult to determine at the outset if a complaint is disciplinary in nature or can be
- 25 ameliorated by education. Other due process concerns were raised that local committees were not
- 26 necessarily resourced to make these determinations, and may not have had the expertise to
- 27 investigate and resolve these complaints. Additional concerns were raised that having local
- 28 committees oversee complaints against judicial officers and court employees created privacy and
- 29 confidentiality concerns for both complainants and respondents because any inquiry by a local
- 30 bias committee would be known and resolved by a group of local attorneys, judicial officers, and
- 31 other committee members who would necessarily need to know the particular facts of the
- 32 complaint, thereby significantly expanding the number of local individuals who were aware of the
- existence or details of the complaint. Ethical concerns were also raised for judicial officers who
- 34 were members of the local bias committees because judicial officers who become aware of
- 35 complaints against other judicial officers may have ethical obligations that require them to take
- 36 appropriate corrective action, which may include reporting the information to the presiding judge
- or justice or the Commission on Judicial Performance. Finally, there were concerns that local bias
- 38 committee complaint procedures would conflict with existing personnel policies and labor
- 39 relations agreements if the local committee attempted to resolve complaints against court
- 40 employees outside of the procedures outlined in these policy documents.
- 41 This standard does not prevent courts and local or regional bias committees from choosing to
- 42 <u>create informal complaint resolution procedures. Some local bias committees have established</u>

1	effective informal complaint resolution procedures for resolving complaints against judicial
2	officers, and each local court and local or regional bias committee should work to find solutions
3	that work best for that local community. If so, they should fully consider how best to address the
4	above concerns. Because of the specific labor and employment laws governing courts and court
5	employees, including the direction provided in rule 10.351 of the California Rules of Court, and
6	the fact that courts already have personnel policies and memorandums of understanding that
7	govern complaints against court employees, having local or regional bias committees resolve
8	complaints against court employees is not recommended.