



## Judicial Council of California

Advisory Committee on Providing  
Access & Fairness

[www.courts.ca.gov/accessfairnesscomm.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/accessfairnesscomm.htm)  
[accessfairnesscomm@jud.ca.gov](mailto:accessfairnesscomm@jud.ca.gov)

Request for ADA accommodations  
should be made at least three business days  
before the meeting and directed to:  
[JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov](mailto:JCCAccessCoordinator@jud.ca.gov)

### ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROVIDING ACCESS AND FAIRNESS

### NOTICE AND AGENDA OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

Open to the Public (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 10.75(c)(1) and (e)(1))

THIS MEETING IS BEING CONDUCTED BY ELECTRONIC MEANS

THIS MEETING IS BEING RECORDED

---

**Date:** April 17, 2025  
**Time:** 12:15 p.m. - 1:15 p.m.  
**Public Call-in Number:** <https://jcc.granicus.com/player/event/4000> (Listen Only)

---

Meeting materials will be posted on the advisory body web page on the California Courts website at least three business days before the meeting.

Members of the public seeking to make an audio recording of the meeting must submit a written request at least two business days before the meeting. Requests can be e-mailed to [accessfairnesscomm@jud.ca.gov](mailto:accessfairnesscomm@jud.ca.gov).

Agenda items are numbered for identification purposes only and will not necessarily be considered in the indicated order.

---

#### **I. OPEN MEETING (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(C)(1))**

---

##### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

##### **Approval of Minutes**

Approve minutes of the February 20, 2025, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness meeting.

---

#### **II. PUBLIC COMMENT (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(K)(1))**

---

This meeting will be conducted by electronic means with a listen only conference line available for the public. As such, the public may submit comments for this meeting only in writing. In accordance with California Rules of Court, rule 10.75(k)(1), written comments pertaining to any agenda item of a regularly noticed open meeting can be submitted up to one complete business day before the meeting. For this specific meeting, comments should be e-mailed to [accessfairnesscomm@jud.ca.gov](mailto:accessfairnesscomm@jud.ca.gov). Only written comments received by **10:00 a.m. April 16, 2025**, will be provided to advisory body members prior to the start of the meeting.

---

**III. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)**

---

**Item 1**

**Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program (Action Required)**

Presenter: *Ms. Eunice Lee, Supervising Analyst, Language Access Services Program, Judicial Council*

Review and approve proposed awards for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program, Cycle 7, Fiscal Year 2025–26.

**Item 2**

**Latest Judicial Demographic Data Summary (No Action Required)**

Presenter: *Ms. Cristina Resendiz-Johnson, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts*

The committee will be provided with an overview and summary of the judicial officer demographic data that was released on 03/01/2025 from the survey collected on 12/31/2024.

---

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

---

**Adjourn to Closed Session**

---

**V. CLOSED SESSION (CAL. RULES OF COURT, RULE 10.75(D))**

---

**Approval of Minutes**

Approve closed portion minutes from the February 20, 2025, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness meeting.

**Adjourn Closed Session**



## Judicial Council of California

Advisory Committee on Providing  
Access & Fairness

[www.courts.ca.gov/accessfairnesscomm.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/accessfairnesscomm.htm)  
[accessfairnesscomm@jud.ca.gov](mailto:accessfairnesscomm@jud.ca.gov)

### ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROVIDING ACCESS AND FAIRNESS

#### MINUTES OF OPEN MEETING WITH CLOSED SESSION

February 20, 2025

12:15 - 1:15 p.m.

Virtual

---

**Advisory Body Members Present:** Hon. Victor Rodriguez (Cochair), Hon. Kevin Brazile (Cochair), Hon. Jose Castillo, Hon. Thomas Delaney, Hon. Monica Diaz, Hon. Rebekah Evenson, Hon. Amy Guerra, Hon. Clare Keithley, Hon. Esther Kim, Ms. Shirley Luo, Hon. Elizabeth Macias, Hon. Lia Martin, Ms. S. Lynn Martinez, Ms. Kemi Mustapha, Mr. Michael Powell, Hon. Michael Rhoads, Hon. Terry Truong, Ms. Katy Van Sant, Hon. Jule Weng-Gutierrez, and Mr. Mitchell Wunsch.

**Advisory Body Members Absent:** Ms. Morgan Baxter, Hon. Victoria Kolakowski, Hon. Cynthia Loo, Ms. Nina Magno, Mr. Lawrence Meyer, Ms. Julie Paik, Ms. Andrea Pella, Ms. Fariba Soroosh, Hon. Laura Walton, and Ms. Twila White.

**Others Present:** Ms. Charlene Depner, Ms. Sarah Jacobvitz, Ms. Eunice Lee, Hon. Martha Matthews, Ms. Anna Maves, Ms. Amanda Morris, Hon. Julie Palafox, Ms. Cristina Resendiz-Johnson, Ms. Heather Resetarits, Ms. Chio Saephanh, Ms. Christy Simons, Ms. Elizabeth Tam-Helmuth, and Mr. Greg Tanaka.

---

#### OPEN MEETING

---

##### Call to Order and Roll Call

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m. and took roll call.

##### Approval of Minutes

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the October 17, 2024, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness meeting. Motion to approve by Judge Kevin Brazile, seconded by Judge Esther Kim. There were no oppositions or abstentions.

---

#### DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS (ITEMS 1-2)

---

##### Item 1

##### Language Access Subcommittee Update (No Action Required)

Presenter: *Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three and Co-chair of the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness*

Justice Rodriguez provided committee members with an update on actions of the Language Access Subcommittee that detailed progress made regarding several PAF annual agenda projects.

The application process for the Signage and Technology Grants, Cycle 7, launched on February 5, 2025. The deadline for courts to submit applications for funding is February 28, 2025. .

Staff have been working with Judicial Council Information Technology staff and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) to develop training webinars and job aids for court clerks, self-help center staff, and Language Access Representatives on the appropriate use of machine translation tools within the courthouse. The Language Access Subcommittee plans to meet on March 27, and will discuss these two language access projects.

## **Item 2**

### **2025 Annual Solicitation for Advisory Body Nominations (No Action Required)**

Presenter: *Ms. Cristina Resendiz-Johnson, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts*

Cristina Resendiz-Johnson reminded committee members that the nominations period is open. Members with expiring terms have been notified and nomination materials can be found on the courts website. Deadline is March 17, 2025.

---

## **A D J O U R N M E N T**

---

There being no further open meeting business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

---

## **C L O S E D   S E S S I O N**

---

### **Approval of Minutes**

The advisory body reviewed and approved the minutes of the closed portion of the December 19, 2024, Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness meeting. Motion to approve by Judge Rebekah Evenson and seconded by Judge Kevin Brazile. There were no oppositions or abstentions.

## **Item 1**

### **Access and Fairness: Lactation Accommodation (Action Required)**

Presenter: *Ms. Sarah Jacobvitz, Attorney, Center for Families, Children & the Courts*

Sarah Jacobvitz briefed committee members on proposal to implement Senate Bill 949 (Stats. 2024, Ch. 159) before requesting a vote to move forward to the Rules Committee. This proposal included a new Rule of court 1.110 and form MC-420.

**Action:** Judge Jule Weng-Gutierrez motioned to approve the bill as amended and move forward to the Rules Committee, Justice Jose Castillo seconded, and the motion carried.

Adjourned closed session at 12:59 p.m.

Approved by the advisory body on enter date.



# Judicial Council of California

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

[www.courts.ca.gov](http://www.courts.ca.gov)

---

## REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

*Item No. 25-069*

For business meeting on July 18, 2025

---

**Title**

Language Access Plan: Allocations for Signage and Technology Grant Program, Cycle 7, Fiscal Year 2025–26

**Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected**

None

**Recommended by**

Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness

Hon. Kevin C. Brazile, Cochair

Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Cochair

Language Access Subcommittee

Hon. Victor A. Rodriguez, Chair

Information Technology Advisory Committee

Hon. Sheila F. Hanson, Chair

Hon. Samantha P. Jessner, Vice-Chair

**Report Type**

Action Required

**Effective Date**

July 18, 2025

**Date of Report**

March 26, 2025

**Contact**

Eunice Lee, Supervising Analyst

Language Access Implementation Unit

415-865-7748

[eunice.lee@jud.ca.gov](mailto:eunice.lee@jud.ca.gov)

Irene Balajadia, Senior Analyst

Language Access Implementation Unit

415-865-8833

[irene.balajadia@jud.ca.gov](mailto:irene.balajadia@jud.ca.gov)

---

### Executive Summary

The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness (PAF) and the Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommend approving proposed grant awards for the Language Access Signage and Technology (S&T) Grant Program of \$2.35 million to improve services and expand language access for court users. For Cycle 7 (fiscal year 2025–26), 17 courts applied for and will be awarded grants for signage and technology projects.

### Recommendation

The Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness and the Information Technology Advisory Committee recommend that the Judicial Council, effective July 18, 2025:

1. Approve the proposed allocations of \$707,792.00 for signage and \$1,642,208 for technology, totaling \$2.35 million for the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program for fiscal year (FY) 2025–26; and
2. Direct staff to work with Branch Accounting and Procurement to draft and execute intra-branch agreements with each awarded court.

The proposed allocations and summary of the requests for funding are included as Attachment A.

## Relevant Previous Council Action

In January 2015, the Judicial Council adopted the *Strategic Plan for Language Access in the California Courts*.<sup>1</sup> The plan provides recommendations, guidance, and a consistent statewide approach to ensure language access for all of California’s approximately 6.4 million limited-English-proficient (LEP) residents, as well as those who are deaf or hard of hearing.

The Budget Act of 2018 (Stats. 2018, ch. 29) included \$2.55 million in ongoing funding for language access signage and technology infrastructure support and equipment needs for the trial courts and the Judicial Council. On September 24, 2019, the Judicial Council adopted a process to annually disburse these S&T grants to the trial courts and directed Language Access Services staff to solicit and review grant applications and develop recommendations for review and approval by the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness, the Information Technology Advisory Committee, the Technology Committee, and the Judicial Council.<sup>2</sup>

Under the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program, courts may be eligible to receive up to \$200,000 for signage projects and up to \$270,000 for technology projects. If total requests are under the annual allocation for each category, then larger amounts may be requested and approved by the council for grants to expend funding.<sup>3</sup>

This is the seventh year of the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program (Cycle 7). For Cycle 6, the council approved S&T grants to all 18 trial courts that applied under the \$2.35 million annual allocation.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at [https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/partners/default/2024-01/CLASP\\_report\\_060514.pdf](https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/partners/default/2024-01/CLASP_report_060514.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Language Access Plan: Signage and Technology Grants* (Sept. 9, 2019), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=7675626&GUID=F2CCA714-356A-41B7-82B5-05C058CE0D6E>.

<sup>3</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Language Access Plan: Signage and Technology Grant Program, Fiscal Year 2021–22: Requests and Proposed Allocations* (Sept. 30, 2021), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9942092&GUID=5220FB28-A269-47DA-BAAD-4D8A89638903>.

<sup>4</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Language Access Plan: Proposed Allocations for Signage and Technology Grant Program, Cycle 6, Fiscal Year 2024–25* (Oct. 22, 2024), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13392861&GUID=20566B41-E6E8-449F-A7E9-B56EDC8B92A8>.

## Analysis/Rationale

To support judicial branch language access expansion efforts, the Budget Act of 2018 included ongoing funding of \$1 million per year for language access signage and \$1.55 million per year for language access technology infrastructure support and equipment needs. Of the \$1.55 million for technology, \$200,000 is dedicated to the Judicial Council for updates to the Language Access Toolkit resources, which now include multilingual resources on the California Courts Self-Help Guide site, and other council language access resource development, including translation of court forms and web content. The amount available to trial courts for technology is, therefore, \$1.35 million each year. With the \$1 million available for signage funding, the total grant amount available to trial courts each year is \$2.35 million.

Following are the goals of the Language Access Signage and Technology Grant Program, which are aimed at enhancing court access for LEP, deaf, or hard of hearing court users:

- Support courts with the development of multilingual signage to help court users navigate the courthouse.
- Assist courts that may need equipment or software that will facilitate communication with court users and the courts.
- Allocate funds to as many trial courts as possible within the given budget to support language access signage and technology initiatives.
- Fund enhancements that provide court users with greater access to the courts and to information in the languages needed to serve court users.
- Encourage courts to establish an ongoing plan that coordinates with other facilities planning and/or with planned or ongoing technology initiatives that support language access as a core service of the court.

On February 5, 2025, Judicial Council Information Technology released a memorandum to courts on how to request funding for various technology grant opportunities via a single application process. The deadline for courts to apply was February 28, 2025.

Judicial Council staff coordinated the review of Cycle 7 Language Access Signage and Technology Grant requests with the other technology funding requests (i.e., IT Modernization Funding Program and Jury Management Systems Grant (JMSG)) to ensure that no court would receive duplicate funding for the same project.

For Cycle 7, 17 courts applied for signage and technology needs. The majority of the projects proposed by all 17 courts can be fully funded, with the following adjustments: one court's signage award will be capped at the maximum award limit; two courts submitted a jury related project, and those two projects are being considered by JMSG; and one court submitted four proposals, of which, two did not meet program requirements, one was withdrawn, leaving one for consideration.

The total recommended signage allocation is \$707,792 leaving \$292,208 unallocated in the signage category. The remaining funding from the signage category is allowed to go toward

related technology category projects as long as they are language access projects that benefit LEP, deaf, or hard of hearing court users. As in prior cycles, the recommendation is to apply this \$292,208 in unallocated signage funds to the technology category.

For the technology category, all but two courts can be fully funded for their requested amounts. Those two courts had requests exceeding the maximum limits. Three courts will receive the maximum technology award of \$270,000. One court will receive a higher technology award of \$300,250 because, upon consultation, the court requested that grant funding go towards one project only; and despite exceeding the standard technology funding limit, the court's total grant award will remain below the \$470,000 total received by the other three courts across both signage and technology categories. See Attachment A for details.

The proposed allocations are to be reviewed and approved by the Advisory Committee on Providing Access and Fairness on April 17, the Information Technology Advisory Committee on April 28, and the Technology Committee on May 5.

**Proposed Allocations: Signage and Technology Grant Program, Cycle 7 (FY 2025–26), in Dollars**

County of Trial Court	Signage Award	Technology Award	Total Proposed Award
<b>Alameda</b>	—	71,366.00	71,366.00
<b>Fresno</b>	34,365.00	—	34,365.00
<b>Kern</b>	—	55,029.00	55,029.00
<b>Los Angeles</b>	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00
<b>Madera</b>	6,427.00	975.00	7,402.00
<b>Monterey</b>	—	115,460.00	115,460.00
<b>Orange</b>	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00
<b>Riverside</b>	—	300,250.00	300,250.00
<b>Sacramento</b>	14,500.00	45,000.00	59,500.00
<b>San Benito</b>	—	25,125.00	25,125.00
<b>San Diego</b>	30,000.00	20,000.00	50,000.00
<b>San Francisco</b>	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00
<b>San Mateo</b>	22,500.00	7,200.00	29,700.00
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	—	11,000.00	11,000.00
<b>Solano</b>	—	115,425.00	115,425.00
<b>Stanislaus</b>	—	11,000.00	11,000.00
<b>Ventura</b>	—	54,378.00	54,378.00
	<b>\$707,792.00</b>	<b>\$1,642,208.00</b>	<b>\$2,350,000.00</b>



The table below summarizes the number of eligible project requests by signage grant category.

#### Signage Grant Projects

Category #	Signage Grant Project	Total # of Projects
1	Translation of Signage	0
2	Court Websites & Wayfinding Translations	2
3	Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	6
4	Automated Queue-Management System	1
5	Multilingual Nonelectronic Signage	2
<b>Total Signage Grant Projects</b>		<b>11</b>

The table below summarizes the number of eligible project requests by technology grant category.

#### Technology Grant Projects

Category #	Technology Grant Project	Total # of Projects
1	Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions to Support Language Access	3
2	Interpreter Equipment	6
3	Scheduling or Other Software	0
4	Multilingual Videos	0
5	Audiovisual Systems Upgrade	3
6	Multilingual Kiosks	4
<b>Total Technology Grant Projects</b>		<b>16</b>

The above two tables summarize the total number of eligible projects requested; some courts requested multiple projects. As a result, the total number of projects exceeds the total number of courts that applied this cycle. For a high-level description of all the grant projects, see Attachment A.

#### Policy implications

Under the grant program, courts can apply for funding for audio or video remote solutions to support language access, including video remote interpreting (VRI), if permitted by their memorandums of understanding and any other agreements between court administration and court employees or independent contractors. All courts, including courts that participate in the

grant program and request funding for VRI equipment, will be asked to follow the council's VRI guidelines for interpreted court events in spoken languages and American Sign Language.<sup>5</sup>

### **Comments**

Public comments were not solicited for this proposal because the recommendations are within the Judicial Council's purview to approve without circulation.

### **Alternatives considered**

No alternatives were considered because the recommended allocations were calculated using the funding methodology approved by the Judicial Council.

### **Fiscal and Operational Impacts**

Funding assists courts with language access signage and technology initiatives. Courts may use grant funding for facilities modification costs that directly relate to the purpose of the grant—for signage or technology—as long as the anticipated facility modification costs are built into the total grant amount. The Signage and Technology Grant Program's application cycle renews annually; however, all state funding is subject to budget approval. The program encourages courts to develop diverse funding plans that align with other facilities or technology initiatives underway or are planned in their court to support language access.

### **Attachments and Links**

1. Attachment A: Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2025–26: Proposed Allocations

---

<sup>5</sup> See Judicial Council of Cal., *Recommended Guidelines and Minimum Specifications for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for Spoken Language-Interpreted Events* (May 21, 2021), <https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/partners/default/2023-07/vri-guidelines.pdf>.

See Judicial Council of Cal., *Recommended Guidelines for Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for ASL-Interpreted Events* (2012), <https://languageaccess.courts.ca.gov/sites/default/files/partners/default/2023-07/cip-asl-vri-guidelines.pdf>.

**Attachment A: Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2025-26: Proposed Allocations  
(Signage)**

#	Trial Court Name	SIGNAGE Project Description(s):	TOTAL SIGNAGE Requested	PROPOSED SIGNAGE Awards
1	Fresno	Digital Docket and Wayfinding Signs - <b>Signage 3 Project:</b> Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	34,365.00	34,365.00
2	Los Angeles	CourtWays: Enhancing Courthouse Navigation Through Digital Signage and Wayfinding - <b>Signage 3 Project:</b> Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	200,000.00	200,000.00
3	Madera	Wayfinding Kiosks (Update for new courtroom & related Translation Services) - <b>Signage 3 Project:</b> Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	3,120.00	3,120.00
		Multilingual Non-electronic Signage - Addition of New Courtroom - <b>Signage 5 Project:</b> Multilingual Non-Electronic Signage	3,307.00	3,307.00
4	Orange	Self-Help Kiosks - <b>Signage 3 Project:</b> Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	270,000.00	200,000.00
5	Sacramento	Multilingual Signage - <b>Signage 5 Project:</b> Multilingual Non-Electronic Signage	14,500.00	14,500.00
6	San Diego	Digital Calendar Board for Courthouse Lobby - <b>Signage 3 Project:</b> Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	30,000.00	30,000.00
7	San Francisco	ACCESS Center PARTWAYS Virtual WayFinder - <b>Signage 3 Project:</b> Multilingual Wayfinding Strategies	200,000.00	200,000.00
8	San Mateo	Bilingual Family Court Services Orientation Video Update - <b>Signage 2 Project:</b> Court Websites Wayfinding Translations	\$9,000.00	\$9,000.00
		Multilingual Online Wayfinding - <b>Signage 2 Project:</b> Court Websites Wayfinding Translations	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
		Line Queueing Upgrade - <b>Signage 4 Project:</b> Automated Queue Management System	\$11,000.00	\$11,000.00
			<b>\$777,792.00</b>	<b>\$707,792.00</b>

## Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2025-26: Proposed Allocations (Technology)

#	Trial Court Name	TECHNOLOGY Project Description(s):	TOTAL TECHNOLOGY Requested	PROPOSED TECHNOLOGY Awards
1	Alameda	Courtroom Microphones and Installation - <b>Technology 5 Project:</b> Audiovisual Systems Upgrade	71,366.00	71,366.00
2	Kern	Courthouse Technology - <b>Technology 6 Project:</b> Multilingual Kiosks	55,029.00	55,029.00
3	Los Angeles	CourtWays: Enhancing Courthouse Navigation Through Digital Signage and Wayfinding - <b>Technology 6 Project:</b> Multilingual Kiosks	12,690,509.00	270,000.00
4	Madera	Language Access & Translation Services - <b>Technology 2 Project:</b> Interpreter Equipment	975.00	975.00
5	Monterey	Interpretation Hardware Replacement - <b>Technology 2 Project:</b> Interpreter Equipment	115,460.00	115,460.00
6	Orange	Video Remote Interpreting Equipment Kits - <b>Technology 1 Project:</b> Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions	270,000.00	270,000.00
7	Riverside	Assisted Listening Device - <b>Technology 5 Project:</b> Audiovisual Systems Upgrade	550,000.00	300,250.00
8	Sacramento	Wayfinding Kiosks - <b>Technology 6 Project:</b> Multilingual Kiosks	45,000.00	45,000.00
9	San Benito	Virtual Public County for Self Help Center - <b>Technology 1 Project:</b> Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions	25,125.00	25,125.00
10	San Diego	Interpreter Audio Equipment - <b>Technology 2 Project:</b> Interpreter Equipment	20,000.00	20,000.00
11	San Francisco	ACCESS Center PARTWAYS Virtual Wayfinder - <b>Technology 6 Project:</b> Multilingual Kiosks	270,000.00	270,000.00
12	San Mateo	Interpreter Equipment Enhancements - <b>Technology 2 Project:</b> Interpreter Equipment	7,200.00	7,200.00
13	Santa Cruz	Interpretation Equipment Refresh - <b>Technology 2 Project:</b> Interpreter Equipment	11,000.00	11,000.00
14	Solano	Courtroom A/V Upgrades - <b>Technology 1 Project:</b> Telephonic/Video Remote Solutions	115,425.00	115,425.00
15	Stanislaus	Update Interpreter Equipment - <b>Technology 2 Project:</b> Interpreter Equipment	11,000.00	11,000.00
16	Ventura	Digital Signage Installation - <b>Technology 5 Project:</b> Audiovisual Systems Upgrade	54,378.00	54,378.00
			<b>\$14,312,467.00</b>	<b>\$1,642,208.00</b>

## Signage and Technology Grant Program, FY 2025–26: Proposed Allocations (Summary)

#	Trial Court Name	Funded in FY 2019-2020	Funded in FY 2020-2021	Funded in FY 2021-2022	Funded in FY 2022-2023	Funded in FY 2023-2024	Funded in FY 2024-2025	Funded in FY 2025-2026	SIGNAGE AWARD	TECHNOLOGY AWARD	TOTAL PROPOSED AWARDS
1	Alameda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		71,366.00	71,366.00
2	Fresno	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	34,365.00		34,365.00
3	Kern	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes		55,029.00	55,029.00
4	Los Angeles	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00
5	Madera	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6,427.00	975.00	7,402.00
6	Monterey	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		115,460.00	115,460.00
7	Orange	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00
8	Riverside	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes		300,250.00	300,250.00
9	Sacramento	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	14,500.00	45,000.00	59,500.00
10	San Benito	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		25,125.00	25,125.00
11	San Diego	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	30,000.00	20,000.00	50,000.00
12	San Francisco	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	200,000.00	270,000.00	470,000.00
13	San Mateo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	22,500.00	7,200.00	29,700.00
14	Santa Cruz	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		11,000.00	11,000.00
15	Solano	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		115,425.00	115,425.00
16	Stanislaus	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes		11,000.00	11,000.00
17	Ventura	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		54,378.00	54,378.00
									<b>\$707,792.00</b>	<b>\$1,642,208.00</b>	<b>\$2,350,000.00</b>

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

**Gender**

Court	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	48	49.0%	50	51.0%	98	100.0%
Trial Court	669	42.9%	890	57.1%	1,559	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>43.3%</b>	<b>943</b>	<b>56.7%</b>	<b>1,664</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**Race/Ethnicity<sup>2</sup>**

Court	American Indian or Alaska Native Only		Asian Only		Black or African American Only		Hispanic or Latino Only		Pacific Islander Only		White Only		Some Other Race Only <sup>3</sup>		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided <sup>4</sup>		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	0	0.0%	11	11.2%	10	10.2%	11	11.2%	0	0.0%	62	63.3%	1	1.0%	3	3.1%	0	0.0%	98	100.0%
Trial Court	6	0.4%	175	11.2%	148	9.5%	199	12.8%	4	0.3%	898	57.6%	21	1.3%	81	5.2%	27	1.7%	1,559	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>962</b>	<b>57.8%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>1,664</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2024. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2024.

2. The race and ethnicity category descriptions were adapted from definitions used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2020. The same category descriptions were used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2010. See page 24 for descriptions of race and ethnicity categories.

3. “Some other race only” includes respondents who indicated they do not consider themselves to be any of the six identified race and ethnicity categories. To provide the most accurate data, the “some other race only” category includes only those respondents who identified some other race or ethnicity that did not clearly fall within one or more of the six identified categories.

4. “Information not provided” includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

**Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation**

Court	Heterosexual Only		Lesbian Only		Gay Only		Bisexual Only		Transgender Only		Nonbinary Only		More Than One GI/SO <sup>2</sup>		Information Not Provided <sup>3</sup>		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	82	83.7%	1	1.0%	3	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	12.2%	98	100.0%
Trial Court	1,239	79.5%	30	1.9%	42	2.7%	7	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.3%	237	15.2%	1,559	100.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,326</b>	<b>79.7%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	<b>1,664</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2024. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2024.

2. Respondents choosing more than a single Sexual Orientation / Gender Identity indicator appear within the “More than one SO/GI” category. This may include JOs who have reported response alternatives including Transgender + Lesbian, Transgender + Heterosexual, and any other combination of SO/GI response alternatives in the SO/GI table.

3. “Information not provided” includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally.

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Gender**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Court	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Supreme Court</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>57.1%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Court of Appeal</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>49.0%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
First District	10	55.6%	8	44.4%	18	100.0%
Second District	18	58.1%	13	41.9%	31	100.0%
Third District	5	50.0%	5	50.0%	10	100.0%
Fourth District	9	39.1%	14	60.9%	23	100.0%
Fifth District	1	11.1%	8	88.9%	9	100.0%
Sixth District	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	7	100.0%
<b>Trial Court</b>	<b>669</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	<b>890</b>	<b>57.1%</b>	<b>1,559</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Alameda	28	46.7%	32	53.3%	60	100.0%
Alpine	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Amador	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Butte	6	54.5%	5	45.5%	11	100.0%
Calaveras	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Colusa	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Contra Costa	19	51.4%	18	48.6%	37	100.0%
Del Norte	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	8	100.0%
Fresno	18	46.2%	21	53.8%	39	100.0%



**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Gender**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Court</b>	<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>		<b>Total Respondents</b>	
<b>Trial Court</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Glenn	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Humboldt	2	40.0%	3	60.0%	5	100.0%
Imperial	2	20.0%	8	80.0%	10	100.0%
Inyo	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Kern	11	32.4%	23	67.6%	34	100.0%
Kings	6	75.0%	2	25.0%	8	100.0%
Lake	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	4	100.0%
Lassen	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Los Angeles	195	43.3%	255	56.7%	450	100.0%
Madera	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	6	100.0%
Marin	4	36.4%	7	63.6%	11	100.0%
Mariposa	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Mendocino	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	6	100.0%
Merced	4	40.0%	6	60.0%	10	100.0%
Modoc	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Mono	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Monterey	8	44.4%	10	55.6%	18	100.0%
Napa	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%
Nevada	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	5	100.0%
Orange	43	38.4%	69	61.6%	112	100.0%
Placer	3	27.3%	8	72.7%	11	100.0%
Plumas	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Riverside	23	35.4%	42	64.6%	65	100.0%
Sacramento	22	37.3%	37	62.7%	59	100.0%
San Benito	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Gender**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Court	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
<b>Trial Court</b>	N	%	N	%	N	%
San Bernardino	24	32.4%	50	67.6%	74	100.0%
San Diego San	59	45.7%	70	54.3%	129	100.0%
Francisco San	19	38.8%	30	61.2%	49	100.0%
Joaquin San Luis	12	42.9%	16	57.1%	28	100.0%
Obispo	7	58.3%	5	41.7%	12	100.0%
San Mateo	15	57.7%	11	42.3%	26	100.0%
Santa Barbara	9	42.9%	12	57.1%	21	100.0%
Santa Clara	34	49.3%	35	50.7%	69	100.0%
Santa Cruz	7	63.6%	4	36.4%	11	100.0%
Shasta	5	45.5%	6	54.5%	11	100.0%
Sierra	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Siskiyou	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	3	100.0%
Solano	11	61.1%	7	38.9%	18	100.0%
Sonoma	9	50.0%	9	50.0%	18	100.0%
Stanislaus	8	38.1%	13	61.9%	21	100.0%
Sutter	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	6	100.0%
Tehama	1	25.0%	3	75.0%	4	100.0%
Trinity	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Tulare	8	44.4%	10	55.6%	18	100.0%
Tuolumne	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	12	46.2%	14	53.8%	26	100.0%
Yolo	5	45.5%	6	54.5%	11	100.0%
Yuba	3	60.0%	2	40.0%	5	100.0%

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2024. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2024.

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Race/Ethnicity**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>	American Indian or Alaska Native Only		Asian Only		Black or African American Only		Hispanic or Latino Only		Pacific Islander Only		White Only		Some Other Race Only <sup>3</sup>		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided <sup>4</sup>		Total Respondents	
Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	0	0.0%	11	11.2%	10	10.2%	11	11.2%	0	0.0%	62	63.3%	1	1.0%	3	3.1%	0	0.0%	98	100.0%
First District	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	3	16.7%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	11	61.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Second District	0	0.0%	4	12.9%	3	9.7%	3	9.7%	0	0.0%	20	64.5%	0	0.0%	1	3.2%	0	0.0%	31	100.0%
Third District	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	7	70.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
Fourth District	0	0.0%	2	8.7%	1	4.3%	4	17.4%	0	0.0%	14	60.9%	0	0.0%	2	8.7%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%
Fifth District	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Sixth District	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Trial Court	6	0.4%	175	11.2%	148	9.5%	199	12.8%	4	0.3%	898	57.6%	21	1.3%	81	5.2%	27	1.7%	1,559	100.0%
Alameda	0	0.0%	9	15.0%	10	16.7%	6	10.0%	0	0.0%	28	46.7%	0	0.0%	7	11.7%	0	0.0%	60	100.0%
Alpine	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Amador	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Butte	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Calaveras	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Colusa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Contra Costa	0	0.0%	6	16.2%	4	10.8%	2	5.4%	0	0.0%	25	67.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	37	100.0%
Del Norte	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	87.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Fresno	1	2.6%	2	5.1%	4	10.3%	7	17.9%	0	0.0%	22	56.4%	1	2.6%	2	5.1%	0	0.0%	39	100.0%
Glenn	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Humboldt	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Imperial	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%	10	100.0%
Inyo	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Kern	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	3	8.8%	4	11.8%	1	2.9%	25	73.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	34	100.0%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Race/Ethnicity**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>	American Indian or Alaska Native Only		Asian Only		Black or African American Only		Hispanic or Latino Only		Pacific Islander Only		White Only		Some Other Race Only <sup>3</sup>		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided <sup>4</sup>		Total Respondents	
Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Trial Court</b>																				
Kings	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	87.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Lake	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Lassen	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Los Angeles	1	0.2%	63	14.0%	63	14.0%	72	16.0%	1	0.2%	210	46.7%	8	1.8%	20	4.4%	12	2.7%	450	100.0%
Madera	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Marin	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Mariposa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mendocino	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Merced	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
Modoc	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Mono	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Monterey	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	12	66.7%	1	5.6%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Napa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Nevada	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Orange	0	0.0%	12	10.7%	9	8.0%	14	12.5%	0	0.0%	69	61.6%	2	1.8%	4	3.6%	2	1.8%	112	100.0%
Placer	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	2	18.2%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	5	45.5%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Plumas	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Riverside	0	0.0%	5	7.7%	9	13.8%	11	16.9%	0	0.0%	35	53.8%	0	0.0%	5	7.7%	0	0.0%	65	100.0%
Sacramento	0	0.0%	10	16.9%	4	6.8%	4	6.8%	0	0.0%	35	59.3%	1	1.7%	3	5.1%	2	3.4%	59	100.0%
San Benito	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
San Bernardino	0	0.0%	8	10.8%	10	13.5%	11	14.9%	1	1.4%	37	50.0%	2	2.7%	5	6.8%	0	0.0%	74	100.0%
San Diego	1	0.8%	7	5.4%	10	7.8%	19	14.7%	0	0.0%	76	58.9%	3	2.3%	6	4.7%	7	5.4%	129	100.0%
San Francisco	0	0.0%	11	22.4%	4	8.2%	5	10.2%	0	0.0%	29	59.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	49	100.0%
San Joaquin	0	0.0%	5	17.9%	3	10.7%	4	14.3%	0	0.0%	14	50.0%	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	28	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	10	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Race/Ethnicity  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>	American Indian or Alaska Native Only		Asian Only		Black or African American Only		Hispanic or Latino Only		Pacific Islander Only		White Only		Some Other Race Only <sup>3</sup>		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided <sup>4</sup>		Total Respondents	
Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Trial Court</b>																				
San Mateo	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	4	15.4%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	16	61.5%	1	3.8%	2	7.7%	0	0.0%	26	100.0%
Santa Barbara	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	1	4.8%	3	14.3%	0	0.0%	16	76.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21	100.0%
Santa Clara	0	0.0%	14	20.3%	2	2.9%	9	13.0%	1	1.4%	36	52.2%	0	0.0%	5	7.2%	2	2.9%	69	100.0%
Santa Cruz	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Shasta	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Sierra	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Siskiyou	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Solano	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	4	22.2%	3	16.7%	0	0.0%	8	44.4%	0	0.0%	2	11.1%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Sonoma	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	2	11.1%	0	0.0%	12	66.7%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Stanislaus	0	0.0%	2	9.5%	2	9.5%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	13	61.9%	0	0.0%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%	21	100.0%
Sutter	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Tehama	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Trinity	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Tulare	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	13	72.2%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Tuolumne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	15.4%	0	0.0%	19	73.1%	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	1	3.8%	26	100.0%
Yolo	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Yuba	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2024. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2024.

2. The race and ethnicity category descriptions were adapted from definitions used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2020. The same category descriptions were used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2010. See page 24 for descriptions of race and ethnicity categories.

3. “Some other race only” includes respondents who indicated they do not consider themselves to be any of the six identified race and ethnicity categories. To provide the most accurate data, the “some other race only” category includes only those respondents who identified some other race or ethnicity that did not clearly fall within one or more of the six identified categories.

4. “Information not provided” includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Responses with Two or More Races**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

	Total Number of Responding Justices/Judges	Responses with Two or More Races	
		Number	Percent
<b>Supreme Court</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Court of Appeal</b>			
<b>Second District</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.2%</b>
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	3.2%
<b>Fourth District</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8.7%</b>
Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino		1	4.3%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	4.3%
<b>Trial Court</b>			
<b>Alameda</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11.7%</b>
Black or African American; White Hispanic		3	5.0%
or Latino; White		2	3.3%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	1.7%
Asian; Black or African American		1	1.7%
<b>El Dorado</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	12.5%
<b>Fresno</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.1%</b>
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	2.6%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	2.6%
Hispanic or Latino; White; Other Race		1	2.6%
<b>Imperial</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10.0%</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	10.0%
<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4.4%</b>
Hispanic or Latino; White		6	1.3%
Asian; White		4	0.9%
Black or African American; White		2	0.4%
White; Other Race		2	0.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	0.2%
Asian; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	0.2%
Asian; Other Race		1	0.2%
Asian; Pacific Islander		1	0.2%
Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	0.2%
Black or African American; White; Other Race		1	0.2%
Hispanic or Latino; White; Other Race		1	0.2%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Responses with Two or More Races**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

	Total Number of Responding Justices/Judges	Responses with Two or More Races	
		Number	Percent
<b>Trial Court</b>			
<b>Mendocino</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	16.7%
<b>Monterey</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5.6%</b>
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	5.6%
<b>Orange</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3.6%</b>
Hispanic or Latino; White		3	2.7%
Asian; Other Race		1	0.9%
<b>Placer</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9.1%</b>
Asian; White		1	9.1%
<b>Riverside</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7.7%</b>
Black or African American; White		2	3.1%
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	1.5%
Asian; White		1	1.5%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	1.5%
<b>Sacramento</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5.1%</b>
Asian; White		1	1.7%
Black or African American; White		1	1.7%
Pacific Islander; White		1	1.7%
<b>San Bernardino</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.8%</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native; Hispanic or Latino		1	1.4%
Asian; Pacific Islander; White		1	1.4%
Asian; White		1	1.4%
Black or African American; White		1	1.4%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	1.4%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Responses with Two or More Races**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

	Total Number of Responding Justices/Judges	Responses with Two or More Races	
		Number	Percent
<b>Trial Court</b>			
<b>San Diego</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4.7%</b>
Hispanic or Latino; White		2	1.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	0.8%
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	0.8%
White; Other Race		1	0.8%
<b>San Joaquin</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.6%</b>
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	3.6%
<b>San Mateo</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7.7%</b>
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	3.8%
<b>Santa Clara</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7.2%</b>
White; Other Race		2	2.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native; Other Race		1	1.4%
Asian; White		1	1.4%
Black or African American; White		1	1.4%
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18.2%</b>
Hispanic or Latino; White		2	18.2%
<b>Solano</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11.1%</b>
Asian; Black or African American		1	5.6%
Asian; White		1	5.6%
<b>Sonoma</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	5.6%
Asian; Black or African American; White		1	5.6%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	5.6%
<b>Stanislaus</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9.5%</b>
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	4.8%
Asian; Hispanic or Latino; Pacific Islander		1	4.8%



**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Responses with Two or More Races**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

	Total Number of Responding Justices/Judges	Responses with Two or More Races	
		Number	Percent
<b>Trial Court</b>			
<b>Tulare</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	5.6%
Black or African American; White; Other Race		1	5.6%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	5.6%
<b>Ventura</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7.7%</b>
Asian; White		1	3.8%
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	3.8%

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2024. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2024.

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

**Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation**

Courts	Heterosexual Only		Lesbian Only		Gay Only		Bisexual Only		Transgender Only		Nonbinary Only		More than One SO / GI <sup>2</sup>		Information Not Provided <sup>3</sup>		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Supreme Court</b>	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
<b>Court of Appeal</b>	82	83.7%	1	1.0%	3	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	12	12.2%	98	100.0%
First District	15	83.3%	1	5.6%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	18	100.0%
Second District	28	90.3%	0	0.0%	1	3.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	6.5%	31	100.0%
Third District	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	10	100.0%
Fourth District	17	73.9%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	21.7%	23	100.0%
Fifth District	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	9	100.0%
Sixth District	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7	100.0%
<b>Trial Court</b>	1,239	79.5%	30	1.9%	42	2.7%	7	0.4%	0	0%	0	0%	4	0.3%	237	15.2%	1,559	100.0%
Alameda	46	76.7%	5	8.3%	4	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	4	6.7%	60	100.0%
Alpine	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Amador	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Butte	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11	100.0%
Calaveras	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Colusa	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Contra Costa	33	89.2%	2	5.4%	1	2.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.7%	37	100.0%
Del Norte	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	7	87.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Fresno	31	79.5%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	17.9%	39	100.0%
Glenn	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Humboldt	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Imperial	7	70.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	10	100.0%
Inyo	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Kern	27	79.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	20.6%	34	100.0%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

**Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation**

Courts	Heterosexual Only		Lesbian Only		Gay Only		Bisexual Only		Transgender Only		Nonbinary Only		More than One SO / GI <sup>2</sup>		Information Not Provided <sup>3</sup>		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kings	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%	8	100.0%
Lake	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Lassen	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Los Angeles	342	76.0%	6	1.3%	18	4.0%	3	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	81	18.0%	450	100.0%
Madera	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	6	100.0%
Marin	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11	100.0%
Mariposa	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mendocino	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	6	100.0%
Merced	10	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
Modoc	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Mono	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Monterey	15	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%
Napa	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Nevada	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	5	100.0%
Orange	87	77.7%	1	0.9%	4	3.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%	19	17.0%	112	100.0%
Placer	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	11	100.0%
Plumas	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Riverside	54	83.1%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	15.4%	65	100.0%
Sacramento	45	76.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	13	22.0%	59	100.0%
San Benito	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
San Bernardino	63	85.1%	2	2.7%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	10.8%	74	100.0%
San Diego	92	71.3%	2	1.6%	6	4.7%	2	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	27	20.9%	129	100.0%
San Francisco	38	77.6%	2	4.1%	5	10.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	8.2%	49	100.0%
San Joaquin	23	82.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	7.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	10.7%	28	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

**Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation**

Courts	Heterosexual Only		Lesbian Only		Gay Only		Bisexual Only		Transgender Only		Nonbinary Only		More than One SO / GI <sup>2</sup>		Information Not Provided <sup>3</sup>		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
San Mateo	23	88.5%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.8%	26	100.0%
Santa Barbara	20	95.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	21	100.0%
Santa Clara	52	75.4%	3	4.3%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	18.8%	69	100.0%
Santa Cruz	9	81.8%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	11	100.0%
Shasta	9	81.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	11	100.0%
Sierra	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Siskiyou	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Solano	15	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%
Sonoma	13	72.2%	2	11.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%
Stanislaus	20	95.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.8%	21	100.0%
Sutter	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	6	100.0%
Tehama	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4	100.0%
Trinity	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Tulare	17	94.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	18	100.0%
Tuolumne	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	22	84.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	15.4%	26	100.0%
Yolo	10	90.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	11	100.0%
Yuba	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	5	100.0%

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2024. The tables do not include demographic information for justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor for judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2024.

2. Respondents choosing more than a single Sexual Orientation / Gender Identity indicator appear within the “More than one SO/GI” category. This may include JOs who have reported response alternatives including Transgender + Lesbian, Transgender + Heterosexual, and any other combination of SO/GI response alternatives in the SO/GI table.

3. “Information not provided” includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally.

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Veteran and Disability Status  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024**

Court	Veteran <sup>1</sup>						Disabled <sup>1</sup>					
	No		Yes		Total Respondents		No		Yes		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Supreme Court</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Court of Appeal</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>96.7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.3%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
First District	13	92.9%	1	7.1%	14	100.0%	13	92.9%	1	7.1%	14	100.0%
Second District	21	91.3%	2	8.7%	23	100.0%	22	95.7%	1	4.3%	23	100.0%
Third District	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Fourth District	8	80.0%	2	20.0%	10	100.0%	10	100.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
Fifth District	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Sixth District	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
<b>Trial Court</b>	<b>951</b>	<b>94.2%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>1,010</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>96.4%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>3.6%</b>	<b>1,014</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Alameda	41	95.3%	2	4.7%	43	100.0%	40	93.0%	3	7.0%	43	100.0%
Alpine	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Amador	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Butte	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Calaveras	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Colusa	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Contra Costa	26	89.7%	3	10.3%	29	100.0%	27	93.1%	2	6.9%	29	100.0%
Del Norte	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Fresno	21	100.0%	0	0.0%	21	100.0%	21	100.0%	0	0.0%	21	100.0%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Veteran and Disability Status  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024**

Court	Veteran <sup>1</sup>						Disabled <sup>1</sup>					
	No		Yes		Total Respondents		No		Yes		Total Respondents	
<b>Trial Court</b>	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Glenn	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Humboldt	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Imperial	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Inyo	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Kern	20	90.9%	2	9.1%	22	100.0%	22	100.0%	0	0.0%	22	100.0%
Kings	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%
Lake	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Lassen	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Los Angeles	256	95.2%	13	4.8%	269	100.0%	264	97.8%	6	2.2%	270	100.0%
Madera	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Marin	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Mariposa	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mendocino	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Merced	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Modoc	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%
Monterey	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Napa	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Nevada	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Orange	70	94.6%	4	5.4%	74	100.0%	71	95.9%	3	4.1%	74	100.0%
Placer	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	6	100.0%	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	6	100.0%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Veteran and Disability Status  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024**

Court	Veteran <sup>1</sup>						Disabled <sup>1</sup>					
	No		Yes		Total Respondents		No		Yes		Total Respondents	
<b>Trial Court</b>	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Plumas	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Riverside	48	98.0%	1	2.0%	49	100.0%	48	98.0%	1	2.0%	49	100.0%
Sacramento	36	94.7%	2	5.3%	38	100.0%	36	94.7%	2	5.3%	38	100.0%
San Benito	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
San Bernardino	44	89.8%	5	10.2%	49	100.0%	47	95.9%	2	4.1%	49	100.0%
San Diego	78	89.7%	9	10.3%	87	100.0%	79	90.8%	8	9.2%	87	100.0%
San Francisco	29	96.7%	1	3.3%	30	100.0%	30	100.0%	0	0.0%	30	100.0%
San Joaquin	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	9	90.0%	1	10.0%	10	100.0%	8	80.0%	2	20.0%	10	100.0%
San Mateo	17	94.4%	1	5.6%	18	100.0%	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Santa Barbara	11	91.7%	1	8.3%	12	100.0%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%
Santa Clara	42	93.3%	3	6.7%	45	100.0%	46	100.0%	0	0.0%	46	100.0%
Santa Cruz	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	8	100.0%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Shasta	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Siskiyou	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%
Solano	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%
Sonoma	14	93.3%	1	6.7%	15	100.0%	14	100.0%	0	0.0%	14	100.0%
Stanislaus	13	81.2%	3	18.8%	16	100.0%	15	88.2%	2	11.8%	17	100.0%
Sutter	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	5	100.0%
Tehama	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Veteran and Disability Status  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024**

Court	Veteran <sup>1</sup>						Disabled <sup>1</sup>					
	No		Yes		Total Respondents		No		Yes		Total Respondents	
<b>Trial Court</b>	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Trinity	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Tulare	11	100.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	11	100.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%
Tuolumne	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	15	88.2%	2	11.8%	17	100.0%	16	88.9%	2	11.1%	18	100.0%
Yolo	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
Yuba	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%

1. Tabled values for veteran status include responses from justices and judges new to the bench in calendar years 2014 through 2024, as well as experienced justices and judges who chose to update their demographic information during the same period. Demographic questions pertaining to veteran and disability status are new as of 2014 and reflect an expansion of the mandate for the collection of demographic information from new justices and judges.



**Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Gender**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Court / Year	Gender				Total Respondents	
	Female		Male			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Supreme Court</b>						
2016	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
2017	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
2018	3	50%	3	50%	6	100.0%
2019	3	50%	3	50%	6	100.0%
2020	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100.0%
2021	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100.0%
2022	3	50%	3	50%	6	100.0%
2023	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
2024	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
2025	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
<b>Court of Appeal</b>						
2016	30	30.9%	67	69.1%	97	100.0%
2017	31	33.3%	62	66.7%	93	100.0%
2018	33	36.7%	57	63.3%	90	100.0%
2019	41	39.4%	63	60.6%	104	100.0%
2020	41	40.2%	61	59.8%	102	100.0%
2021	39	39.4%	60	60.6%	99	100.0%
2022	38	40.4%	56	59.6%	94	100.0%
2023	37	42%	51	58%	88	100.0%
2024	42	43.3%	55	56.7%	97	100.0%
2025	48	49%	50	51%	98	100.0%

**Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Gender  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Court / Year	Gender				Total Respondents	
	Female		Male			
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Trial Court</b>						
2016	517	32.9%	1,053	67.1%	1,570	100.0%
2017	531	33.5%	1,053	66.5%	1,584	100.0%
2018	543	34.3%	1,039	65.7%	1,582	100.0%
2019	589	36.1%	1,044	63.9%	1,633	100.0%
2020	604	37.2%	1,019	62.8%	1,623	100.0%
2021	598	37.4%	999	62.6%	1,597	100.0%
2022	617	38.4%	989	61.6%	1,606	100.0%
2023	635	39.7%	963	60.3%	1,598	100.0%
2024	668	41.1%	959	58.9%	1,627	100.0%
2025	669	42.9%	890	57.1%	1,559	100.0%
<b>Total</b>						
2016	551	32.9%	1,123	67.1%	1,674	100.0%
2017	566	33.6%	1,118	66.4%	1,684	100.0%
2018	579	34.5%	1,099	65.5%	1,678	100.0%
2019	633	36.3%	1,110	63.7%	1,743	100.0%
2020	648	37.4%	1,084	62.6%	1,732	100.0%
2021	640	37.6%	1,063	62.4%	1,703	100.0%
2022	658	38.6%	1,048	61.4%	1,706	100.0%
2023	676	39.9%	1,017	60.1%	1,693	100.0%
2024	714	41.2%	1,017	58.8%	1,731	100.0%
2025	721	43.3%	943	56.7%	1,664	100.0%

1. The calendar years in which the demographic data was released may be found in the first column of the table. The 2016 through 2025 data reflect the number of justices and judges on the bench as of December 31 of the previous year.

Note: The changes in percentages from year to year are the result of more than one factor, including: (1) new judicial appointments; (2) judicial retirements; and (3) newly acquired data from judges on the bench who previously did not provide their demographic information.

**Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges**  
**Relative to Race/Ethnicity**  
**(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))**  
**As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup>	American Indian or Alaska Native Only		Asian Only		Black or African American Only		Hispanic or Latino Only		Pacific Islander Only		White Only		Some Other Race Only <sup>3</sup>		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided <sup>4</sup>		Total Respondents	
Court / Year	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Supreme Court</b>																				
2016	0	0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	7	100.0%
2017	0	0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	7	100.0%
2018	0	0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%	6	100.0%
2019	0	0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%	6	100.0%
2020	0	0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	7	100.0%
2021	0	0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	7	100.0%
2022	0	0%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	0	0%	0	0%	2	33.3%	0	0%	1	16.7%	0	0%	6	100.0%
2023	0	0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	1	14.3%	0	0%	7	100.0%
2024	0	0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100.0%
2025	0	0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	100.0%
<b>Court of Appeal</b>																				
2016	0	0%	2	2.1%	8	8.2%	6	6.2%	0	0%	73	75.3%	1	1%	6	6.2%	1	1%	97	100.0%
2017	0	0%	2	2.2%	9	9.7%	5	5.4%	0	0%	71	76.3%	1	1.1%	5	5.4%	0	0%	93	100.0%
2018	0	0%	2	2.2%	10	11.1%	6	6.7%	0	0%	65	72.2%	2	2.2%	5	5.6%	0	0%	90	100.0%
2019	0	0%	5	4.8%	10	9.6%	7	6.7%	0	0%	75	72.1%	2	1.9%	5	4.8%	0	0%	104	100.0%
2020	0	0%	6	5.9%	9	8.8%	6	5.9%	0	0%	75	73.5%	2	2%	4	3.9%	0	0%	102	100.0%
2021	0	0%	5	5.1%	10	10.1%	6	6.1%	0	0%	72	72.7%	2	2%	4	4%	0	0%	99	100.0%
2022	0	0%	5	5.3%	11	11.7%	7	7.4%	0	0%	66	70.2%	2	2.1%	3	3.2%	0	0%	94	100.0%
2023	0	0%	5	5.7%	8	9.1%	8	9.1%	0	0%	62	70.5%	2	2.3%	3	3.4%	0	0%	88	100.0%
2024	0	0%	8	8.2%	9	9.3%	11	11.3%	0	0%	64	66%	2	2.1%	3	3.1%	0	0%	97	100.0%
2025	0	0%	11	11.2%	10	10.2%	11	11.2%	0	0%	62	63.3%	1	1%	3	3.1%	0	0%	98	100.0%

**Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Race/Ethnicity  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024<sup>1</sup>**

Race/Ethnicity <sup>2</sup> Court / Year	American Indian or Alaska Native Only		Asian Only		Black or African American Only		Hispanic or Latino Only		Pacific Islander Only		White Only		Some Other Race Only <sup>3</sup>		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided <sup>4</sup>		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Trial Court</b>																				
2016	9	0.6%	104	6.6%	101	6.4%	158	10.1%	4	0.3%	1,082	68.9%	19	1.2%	50	3.2%	43	2.7%	1,570	100.0%
2017	9	0.6%	106	6.7%	106	6.7%	163	10.3%	4	0.3%	1,086	68.6%	16	1%	52	3.3%	42	2.7%	1,584	100.0%
2018	9	0.6%	116	7.3%	111	7%	166	10.5%	4	0.3%	1,067	67.4%	17	1.1%	51	3.2%	41	2.6%	1,582	100.0%
2019	8	0.5%	127	7.8%	123	7.5%	177	10.8%	4	0.2%	1,079	66.1%	16	1%	62	3.8%	37	2.3%	1,633	100.0%
2020	8	0.5%	129	7.9%	124	7.6%	181	11.2%	5	0.3%	1,059	65.2%	16	1%	67	4.1%	34	2.1%	1,623	100.0%
2021	7	0.4%	132	8.3%	125	7.8%	184	11.5%	5	0.3%	1,030	64.5%	15	0.9%	66	4.1%	33	2.1%	1,597	100.0%
2022	8	0.5%	143	8.9%	130	8.1%	192	12%	5	0.3%	1,009	62.8%	15	0.9%	71	4.4%	33	2.1%	1,606	100.0%
2023	7	0.4%	151	9.4%	136	8.5%	202	12.6%	6	0.4%	976	61.1%	16	1%	72	4.5%	32	2%	1,598	100.0%
2024	7	0.4%	160	9.8%	143	8.8%	204	12.5%	5	0.3%	978	60.1%	21	1.3%	80	4.9%	29	1.8%	1,627	100.0%
2025	6	0.4%	175	11.2%	148	9.5%	199	12.8%	4	0.3%	898	57.6%	21	1.3%	81	5.2%	27	1.7%	1,559	100.0%
<b>Total</b>																				
2016	9	0.5%	108	6.5%	110	6.6%	165	9.9%	4	0.2%	1,157	69.1%	20	1.2%	57	3.4%	44	2.6%	1,674	100.0%
2017	9	0.5%	110	6.5%	116	6.9%	169	10%	4	0.2%	1,159	68.8%	17	1%	58	3.4%	42	2.5%	1,684	100.0%
2018	9	0.5%	120	7.2%	122	7.3%	173	10.3%	4	0.2%	1,133	67.5%	19	1.1%	57	3.4%	41	2.4%	1,678	100.0%
2019	8	0.5%	134	7.7%	134	7.7%	185	10.6%	4	0.2%	1,155	66.3%	18	1%	68	3.9%	37	2.1%	1,743	100.0%
2020	8	0.5%	137	7.9%	134	7.7%	188	10.9%	5	0.3%	1,136	65.6%	18	1%	72	4.2%	34	2%	1,732	100.0%
2021	7	0.4%	138	8.1%	137	8%	191	11.2%	5	0.3%	1,104	64.8%	17	1%	71	4.2%	33	1.9%	1,703	100.0%
2022	8	0.5%	149	8.7%	143	8.4%	199	11.7%	5	0.3%	1,077	63.1%	17	1%	75	4.4%	33	1.9%	1,706	100.0%
2023	7	0.4%	157	9.3%	146	8.6%	211	12.5%	6	0.4%	1,040	61.4%	18	1.1%	76	4.5%	32	1.9%	1,693	100.0%
2024	7	0.4%	169	9.8%	155	9%	216	12.5%	5	0.3%	1,044	60.3%	23	1.3%	83	4.8%	29	1.7%	1,731	100.0%
2025	6	0.4%	187	11.2%	161	9.7%	211	12.7%	4	0.2%	962	57.8%	22	1.3%	84	5%	27	1.6%	1,664	100.0%

1. The calendar years in which the demographic data was released may be found in the first column of the table. The 2015 through 2024 data reflect the number of justices and judges on the bench as of December 31 of the previous year.

2. The race and ethnicity category descriptions were adapted from definitions used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2000. The same category descriptions were used by the U.S. Census Bureau in Census 2010. See page 24 for descriptions of race and ethnicity categories.

3. “Some other race only” includes respondents who indicated they do not consider themselves to be any of the six identified race and ethnicity categories. To provide the most accurate data, the “some other race only” category includes only those respondents who identified some other race or ethnicity that did not clearly fall within one or more of the six identified categories

4. “Information not provided” includes non-responses by active justices and judges participating in the survey that did not respond to a given survey question, as well as a smaller group of active justices and judges that have not responded to the survey more generally.

**Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges  
Relative to Race/Ethnicity  
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))  
As of December 31, 2024**

**Race/Ethnicity Categories**

The category descriptions are adapted from definitions used by the U.S. Census Bureau in 2010 and again in 2020, with the 2010 census being the first in which respondents were invited to identify more than one category.

*American Indian or Alaska Native:* A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

*Asian:* A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent. The category includes persons who indicate their race as Cambodian, Chinese, East Indian, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Malaysian, Pakistani, Thai, or Vietnamese.

*Black or African American:* A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

*Hispanic or Latino:* A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

*Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander:* A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

*White:* A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.