



JUDICIAL COUNCIL of CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. BRAD R. HILL
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. STACY BOULWARE
EURIE
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. JOAN K. IRION
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. MARIA D. HERNANDEZ
Chair, Technology Committee

HON. ANN C. MOORMAN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Charles S. Crompton
Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Hon. Maureen F. Hallahan
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Ash Kalra
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Hon. Ricardo R. Ocampo
Mr. Craig M. Peters
Hon. Michael Rhoads
Ms. Dena Stone
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg
Hon. Tamara L. Wood

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Ms. Kate Bieker
Hon. Ryan Davis
Mr. Charles Johnson
Hon. Jeffrey C. Kauffman
Hon. Patricia L. Kelly
Mr. Darrel E. Parker
Mr. David W. Slayton

MS. MICHELLE CURRAN
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

December 19, 2025

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins
Legislative Counsel
1021 O Street, Suite 3210
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Erika Contreras
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 305
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Sue Parker
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 319
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Report on the Use of Remote Technology in Civil and Criminal Actions by the Trial Courts, as required under Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8

Dear Ms. Jenkins, Ms. Contreras, and Ms. Parker:

Under Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8, the Judicial Council is submitting a report on the use of remote technology in proceedings by the trial courts.

If you have any questions related to this report, please contact Ms. Jessica Devencenzi, Principal Advisor, Policy and Research, at Jessica.Devencenzi@jud.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Michelle Curran
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

Ms. Cara L. Jenkins

Ms. Erika Contreras

Ms. Sue Parker

December 19, 2025

Page 2

MC/JD/mc

Enclosures

cc: Eric Dang, Counsel, Office of Senate President pro Tempore Mike McGuire

Emelyn Rodriguez, General Counsel, Office of Assembly Speaker Robert Rivas

Shaun Naidu, Policy Consultant, Office of Assembly Speaker Robert Rivas

Anita Lee, Principal Fiscal and Policy Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office

Gabriel Petek, Legislative Analyst, Legislative Analyst's Office

Mark Jimenez, Principal Program Budget Analyst, Department of Finance

Henry Ng, Budget Analyst, Department of Finance

Margie Estrada, Chief Counsel, Senate Judiciary Committee

Stephanie Jordan, Counsel, Senate Public Safety Committee

Eric Csizmar, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office

Morgan Branch, Consultant, Senate Republican Policy Office

Alison Merrilees, Chief Counsel, Assembly Judiciary Committee

Andrew Ironside, Chief Counsel, Assembly Public Safety Committee

Nora Brackbill, Consultant, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee

Jennifer Kim, Consultant, Assembly Budget Committee

Lyndsay Mitchell, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget

Gary Olson, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget

Daryl Thomas, Consultant, Assembly Republican Office of Policy & Budget

Cory T. Jasperson, Director, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council

Alona Daniliuk, Administrative Coordinator, Governmental Affairs, Judicial Council



JUDICIAL COUNCIL of CALIFORNIA

455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
Tel. 415-865-4200
Fax 415-865-4205
courts.ca.gov

HON. PATRICIA GUERRERO
Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council

HON. BRAD R. HILL
Chair, Executive and Planning Committee

HON. STACY BOULWARE
EURIE
Chair, Legislation Committee

HON. JOAN K. IRION
Chair, Rules Committee

HON. MARIA D. HERNANDEZ
Chair, Technology Committee

HON. ANN C. MOORMAN
Chair, Judicial Branch Budget Committee
Chair, Litigation Management Committee

Hon. Maria Lucy Armendariz
Hon. Bunmi O. Awoniyi
Hon. Carol A. Corrigan
Hon. Charles S. Crompton
Hon. Judith K. Dulcich
Hon. Maureen F. Hallahan
Ms. Rachel W. Hill
Hon. Ash Kalra
Ms. Gretchen Nelson
Hon. Ricardo R. Ocampo
Mr. Craig M. Peters
Hon. Michael Rhoads
Ms. Dena Stone
Hon. Thomas J. Umberg
Hon. Tamara L. Wood

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Ms. Kate Bieker
Hon. Ryan Davis
Mr. Charles Johnson
Hon. Jeffrey C. Kauffman
Hon. Patricia L. Kelly
Mr. Darrel E. Parker
Mr. David W. Slayton

MS. MICHELLE CURRAN
Administrative Director
Judicial Council

Report Title: Report on the Use of Remote Technology in Civil Actions by the Trial Courts

Statutory citation: Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8


The Judicial Council has submitted a report to the Legislature in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8. The following summary of the report is provided under the requirements of Government Code section 9795.

Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8 requires the Judicial Council to submit a report to the Legislature on or before December 31 of each year until January 1, 2027, on the use of remote technology in trial court civil and criminal proceedings. This report provides county-specific data mandated by the bill, which includes (1) the number of proceedings conducted with the use of remote technology; (2) any superior court in which technology issues or problems occurred; (3) the superior courts in which remote technology was used; (4) the types of trial court conferences, hearings, or proceedings in which remote technology was used; (5) the cost of purchasing, leasing, or upgrading remote technology; (6) the type of technology and equipment purchased or leased; and (7) any other information necessary to evaluate the use of remote proceedings by the courts. This report fulfills these legislative reporting requirements.

Data in the attached report, responsive to section 367.8, was collected from the trial courts, relying on multiple data sources to fulfill the specified requirements, including:

- Survey data;
- Trial court case management system data; and
- Judicial Branch Statistical Information System data.

The full report is available at www.courts.ca.gov/7466.htm. A printed copy of the report may be obtained by calling 916-263-1905.



December 19, 2025

Report on the Use of Remote Technology in Civil and Criminal Actions by the Trial Courts

Report to the Legislature Required Under
Code of Civil Procedure Section 367.8



Judicial Council of California

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

Hon. Patricia Guerrero
*Chief Justice of California and
Chair of the Judicial Council*

Michelle Curran
*Administrative Director
Judicial Council*

Rob Oyung
*Chief Deputy Director
Judicial Council*

POLICY AND RESEARCH

Jessica Devencenzi
Principal Advisor

Saskia Kim
Attorney

Marshall Comia
*Associate Analyst
Primary Author of Report*

Christian Mendoza
Judicial Fellow

RESEARCH, ANALYTICS, AND DATA

Leah Rose-Goodwin
Chief Data and Analytics Officer

Kristin Greenaway
Manager

Mustafa Sagir
Supervising Research Analyst

Kyle Capuli
Research Analyst

Executive Summary

Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8 requires the Judicial Council to submit a report to the Legislature on or before December 31 of each year until January 1, 2027, on the use of remote technology in trial court civil and criminal proceedings. This report provides county-specific data mandated by the bill, which includes (1) the number of proceedings conducted with the use of remote technology; (2) any superior court in which technology issues or problems occurred; (3) the superior courts in which remote technology was used; (4) the types of trial court conferences, hearings, or proceedings in which remote technology was used; (5) the cost of purchasing, leasing, or upgrading remote technology; (6) the type of technology and equipment purchased or leased; and (7) any other information necessary to evaluate the use of remote proceedings by the courts. This report fulfills these legislative reporting requirements and includes data for a 12-month period, from September 1, 2024, through August 31, 2025.

Background

On April 6, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Judicial Council of California adopted emergency rule 3 of the California Rules of Court, which generally permitted courts to require that judicial proceedings and court operations be conducted remotely.¹

Subsequently, Senate Bill 241 (Stats. 2021, ch. 214) authorized a party to appear remotely for a court conference, hearing, proceeding, or trial in civil cases through the use of remote technology until July 1, 2023. Assembly Bill 177 (Stats. 2021, ch. 257) required the Judicial Council to submit a report to the Legislature and the Governor by January 1, 2023, regarding the use of remote technology in civil actions by trial courts.

On June 30, 2023, Governor Newsom signed Senate Bill 133 (Stats. 2023, ch. 34) to extend statutory authorization for a party to appear remotely for a court conference, hearing, proceeding, or trial using remote technology in civil cases until January 1, 2026. The bill also added Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8, which required the Judicial Council to submit a report to the Legislature on or before December 31, 2023, and annually thereafter, to assess the impact of technology issues or problems affecting remote proceedings, as included under Code of Civil Procedure sections 367.75 and 367.76, and section 679.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code. The statute also requires that the report include all purchases and leases of technology or equipment to facilitate remote conferences, hearings, or proceedings. Additionally, SB 133 required the Judicial Council to adopt, by April 1, 2024, minimum standards for courtroom technology necessary to enable remote participation in court proceedings. The council adopted *Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings* at its March 15, 2024, business

¹ Emergency rule 3 has since been rescinded.

meeting.² These standards, which became effective April 1, 2024, provided that, after July 1, 2024, the minimum technology standards apply in courtrooms in which the court is conducting a remote proceeding.³

On July 2, 2024, Governor Newsom signed Assembly Bill 170 (Stats. 2024, ch. 51) to extend the sunset date on existing statutory authorization for remote proceedings to January 1, 2027. In the same way that superior courts were required to report specified data regarding civil remote proceedings, the bill also requires courts to annually report on concerning criminal remote proceedings to the Judicial Council by October 1 and to the Legislature by December 31. This bill also requires courts to annually certify that each courtroom of the superior court in which the court is conducting a remote proceeding meets the *Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings* adopted by the council.

Reports for previous reporting periods are available on the “Legislative Reports” webpage of the California Courts website at courts.ca.gov/news-reference/reports-publications/reports-legislature.

Reporting Requirements

Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8(a) requires the Judicial Council to provide county-specific data that includes the following:

- (1) The number of proceedings conducted with the use of remote technology.
- (2) Any superior court in which technology issues or problems occurred.
- (3) The superior courts in which remote technology was used.
- (4) The types of trial court conferences, hearings, or proceedings in which remote technology was used.
- (5) The cost of purchasing, leasing, or upgrading remote technology.
- (6) The type of technology and equipment purchased or leased.
- (7) Any other information necessary to evaluate the use of remote proceedings by the courts.

For the purposes of this reporting requirement, the operational definition of remote technology is as follows: Video, telephone, and/or audio technology used to connect at least one user to a proceeding. Any combination of in-person and remote proceedings by parties is treated as a

² Judicial Council of Cal., Advisory Com. Rep., *Judicial Branch Technology: Minimum Standards for Courtroom Technology to Permit Remote Participation in Court Proceedings* (Sen. Bill 133) (Feb. 21, 2024), <https://jcc.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=12698709&GUID=FBD0CCEA-35B4-4177-BD3D-F9F3602CB8CF>.

³ Judicial Council of Cal., *Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings* (SB 133) (Apr. 1, 2024), courts.ca.gov/system/files/file/minimum-technology-standards-20240401.pdf.

remote proceeding (i.e., entirely remote and hybrid proceedings are both considered remote proceedings).

Code of Civil Procedure section 367.8(c)(1) also requires the court executive officer of each superior court to annually certify that each courtroom of the superior court in which the court is conducting a remote proceeding meets the *Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings* adopted by the council.

Requirement 1: The number of proceedings conducted with the use of remote technology

A total of 56 courts submitted data regarding remote proceedings in civil cases, and 54 courts submitted data for criminal cases.⁴ Table 1 (below) displays the count of civil remote proceedings by reporting courts and Table 2 displays the count of criminal remote proceedings by reporting courts. The two tables display the total count of proceedings for each county and the percentage of total civil and criminal remote proceedings statewide that those counts represent, respectively.

Table 1. Civil Remote Proceedings by Reporting Courts

County	Total	% of Civil Remote Proceedings Statewide
Alameda	23,855	2.0%
Alpine	62	0.0
Amador	1,070	0.1
Butte	3,489	0.3
Calaveras	321	0.0
Colusa	313	0.0
Contra Costa	26,593	2.2
Del Norte*	—	—
El Dorado	5,570	0.5
Fresno	19,606	1.6
Glenn	433	0.0
Humboldt	5,755	0.5
Imperial	2,374	0.2
Inyo	871	0.1
Kern	17,284	1.4
Kings	4,639	0.4
Lake	6,476	0.5
Lassen	1,114	0.1

⁴ Civil limited, civil unlimited, civil mental health, family law, juvenile delinquency, juvenile dependency, landlord-tenant, probate, and small claims matters.

County	Total	% of Civil Remote Proceedings Statewide
Los Angeles ¹	489,992	41.0
Madera	7,300	0.6
Marin	9,588	0.8
Mariposa	755	0.1
Mendocino	3,137	0.3
Merced	10,928	0.9
Modoc	614	0.1
Mono	928	0.1
Monterey	10,368	0.9
Napa	5,882	0.5
Nevada	1,792	0.1
Orange	96,183	8.0
Placer	14,150	1.2
Plumas*	—	—
Riverside	52,475	4.4
Sacramento ¹	23,432	2.0
San Benito	650	0.1
San Bernardino	34,849	2.9
San Diego ²	85,454	7.1
San Francisco	35,341	3.0
San Joaquin	53,316	4.5
San Luis Obispo	13,024	1.1
San Mateo	9,649	0.8
Santa Barbara	20,731	1.7
Santa Clara ³	9,564	0.8
Santa Cruz	6,774	0.6
Shasta	4,611	0.4
Sierra	272	0.0
Siskiyou	1,549	0.1
Solano	5,573	0.5
Sonoma	7,912	0.7
Stanislaus*	9,878	0.8
Sutter	1,213	0.1
Tehama	1,518	0.1
Trinity	370	0.0
Tulare	10,949	0.9
Tuolumne ⁴	495	0.0
Ventura	27,543	2.3

County	Total	% of Civil Remote Proceedings Statewide
Yolo	4,633	0.4
Yuba	2,672	0.2
Total	1,195,889	100.0%

* Unable to report data.

¹ Only reported juvenile case types.

² Unable to report mental health and juvenile case data.

³ Only reported civil limited, civil unlimited, and family law data.

⁴ Did not report data for September 2024–February 2025.

Figure 1 displays the proportion of specific civil case types for reporting courts.

Figure 1. Proportion and Types of Civil Remote Proceedings Heard




Table 2: Criminal Remote Proceedings by Reporting Courts

County	Total	% of Criminal Remote Proceedings Statewide
Alameda	21,228	3.9%
Alpine	525	0.1
Amador	4,432	0.8
Butte	5,817	1.1
Calaveras	32	0.0
Colusa	4	0.0
Contra Costa	2,058	0.4
Del Norte*	—	—
El Dorado	5,422	1.0
Fresno	5,232	1.0
Glenn	134	0.0
Humboldt	1,824	0.3
Imperial	858	0.2
Inyo	407	0.1
Kern	12,549	2.3
Kings	3,425	0.6
Lake	8,646	1.6
Lassen	1,969	0.4
Los Angeles	110,887	20.1
Madera	8,044	1.5
Marin	4,353	0.8
Mariposa	951	0.2
Mendocino	8,164	1.5
Merced	13,806	2.5
Modoc	1,336	0.2
Mono	2,892	0.5
Monterey	5,929	1.1
Napa	4,922	0.9
Nevada	1,315	0.2
Orange	75,930	13.8
Placer	4,521	0.8
Plumas*	—	—
Riverside	117	0.0
Sacramento*	—	—
San Benito	173	0.0
San Bernardino	26,728	4.9
San Diego ¹	20,051	3.6

County	Total	% of Criminal Remote Proceedings Statewide
San Francisco	65,217	11.8
San Joaquin	9,624	1.7
San Luis Obispo	2,391	0.4
San Mateo	1,495	0.3
Santa Barbara	19,841	3.6
Santa Clara*	—	—
Santa Cruz	8,949	1.6
Shasta	2,112	0.4
Sierra	825	0.1
Siskiyou	919	0.2
Solano	4,368	0.8
Sonoma ²	1,562	0.3
Stanislaus	13,604	2.5
Sutter	3,019	0.5
Tehama	655	0.1
Trinity	453	0.1
Tulare	16,737	3.0
Tuolumne ³	778	0.1
Ventura	20,269	3.7
Yolo	12,812	2.3
Yuba	88	0.0
Total	550,399	100.0%

* Unable to report data


¹ Only reports infractions

² Unable to report infractions.

³ Did not report data for September 2024–February 2025.

Figure 2 displays the proportion of specific criminal case types for reporting courts.

Figure 2. Proportion and Types of Criminal Remote Proceedings Heard



Requirement 2: Any superior court in which technology issues or problems occurred

Judicial Council staff collected survey feedback data from users of the Zoom virtual meeting platform for both civil and criminal remote proceedings, which is widely used throughout California courts. To collect this data, all participants in proceedings using the Zoom platform received a short survey about their remote experience. An initial question asked if the user had a negative or positive experience. If the participants indicated a negative experience, they were encouraged to give more specific information about the issue.

Table 3 shows the percentage of respondents who reported either an audio or a visual technical issue during the remote proceeding. Respondents reported audio issues including inability to hear the proceeding, others unable to hear the respondent, disruptive noises (static noises, echoes, etc.), or sound cutting in and out. Respondents also reported visual issues including inability to see things on the screen, others unable to see the respondent, frozen images, different views not working, and poor lighting.

Table 3. Percentage of Respondents Reporting an Audio or Visual Technical Issue

Court	# of Responses	% Reporting an Audio Technical Issue	% Reporting a Visual Technical Issue
Alameda	8,613	1.1%	0.6%
Alpine	134	2.2	0.7
Amador	84	6.0	3.6
Butte	322	1.6	0.3
Calaveras	4	0.0	0.0
Colusa	15	0.0	6.7
Contra Costa	1,910	1.9	0.7
Del Norte	51	3.9	0.0
El Dorado	8	0.0	0.0
Fresno	66	4.5	3.0
Glenn*	—	—	—
Humboldt	251	0.0	0.0
Imperial	8	0.0	0.0
Inyo	42	4.8	0.0
Kern	144	3.5	0.7
Kings	91	3.3	0.0
Lake	232	0.0	0.0
Lassen	82	2.4	0.0
Los Angeles ¹	—	—	—
Madera	1	0.0	0.0
Marin	1,904	1.0	0.9
Mariposa	621	0.2	0.3
Mendocino	696	2.3	0.4
Merced	1,114	1.3	0.4
Modoc	10	0.0	0.0
Mono	56	3.6	1.8
Monterey	748	1.6	0.9
Napa	7	42.9	0.0
Nevada	534	1.5	1.1
Orange	4,022	2.2	1.3
Placer	39	2.6	5.1
Plumas	16	0.0	6.3
Riverside	2,478	4.0	0.9
Sacramento	6,096	1.8	1.3
San Benito	1	0.0	0.0
San Bernardino	3,674	2.2	0.6

Court	# of Responses	% Reporting an Audio Technical Issue	% Reporting a Visual Technical Issue
San Diego	16	6.3	6.3
San Francisco	929	3.3	1.4
San Joaquin	158	3.8	1.9
San Luis Obispo	684	1.5	0.7
San Mateo	1,156	0.9	1.0
Santa Barbara	701	1.9	1.3
Santa Clara	22	4.5	4.5
Santa Cruz	1,071	0.8	0.4
Shasta*	—	—	—
Sierra	215	0.0	0.0
Siskiyou	565	0.9	0.5
Solano	1,200	1.2	0.7
Sonoma	1,528	1.8	0.8
Stanislaus	475	1.7	0.6
Sutter	7	0.0	0.0
Tehama*	—	—	—
Trinity	1	100.0	100.0
Tulare	222	1.4	2.3
Tuolumne	300	0.0	0.3
Ventura*	—	—	—
Yolo	9	0.0	0.0
Yuba	138	1.4	0.7
Unspecified Court	1,055	0.9	0.5
Total	44,526	1.7%	0.9%


* Unable to report data.

¹ Court collects this data in a different manner; see discussion of LA Court Connect following Figure 2.

Figure 2 displays the percentage of external court users and internal court workers who experienced audio technical issues or visual technical issues. Of the 53 responses to the Zoom experience survey, 19,436 (43.7 percent) were from external court users and 25,090 (56.3 percent) were from court workers.⁵ Overall, only 1.7 percent of total respondents reported experiencing an audio technical issue and 0.9 percent of total respondents reported experiencing a visual technical issue. External court users reported audio issues 2.8 percent of the time and visual issues 1.5 percent of the time.

⁵ Court workers are any individuals with a court email address, including court clerks and judicial officers.

Figure 2. Audio and Visual Technical Issues—External Court Users vs. Internal Court Workers



The Superior Court of Los Angeles County does not use the Zoom platform; instead, it employs a custom-built remote technology platform called LA Court Connect for remote proceedings in most case types. In December 2024, the court began surveying external court users (but not internal court workers) about their experience participating in remote proceedings. A link to the survey is sent once a week to all remote participants, with each participant receiving only one invitation regardless of the number of hearings they attend throughout the week. From December 30, 2024, to August 31, 2025, 8,913 external court users responded to the survey. Of those respondents, 1,484 (16.6 percent) reported either an audio technical issue, a visual technical issue, or both.⁶

Requirement 3: The superior courts in which remote technology was used

All 58 county superior courts reported using remote technology between September 1, 2024, and August 31, 2025. This total was reached by combining the responses from Requirement 1 and Requirement 4.

⁶ Respondents reported audio technical issues including not being able to hear other remote proceeding participants, others not being able to hear the respondent, and overall poor audio quality. Respondents also reported visual technical issues including not being able to see other remote proceeding participants, others not being able to see the respondent, and overall poor video quality.

Table 4. Remote Technology Use by Court

County	Used Remote Technology	County	Used Remote Technology
Alameda	✓	Orange	✓
Alpine	✓	Placer	✓
Amador	✓	Plumas	✓
Butte	✓	Riverside	✓
Calaveras	✓	Sacramento	✓
Colusa	✓	San Benito	✓
Contra Costa	✓	San Bernardino	✓
Del Norte	✓	San Diego	✓
El Dorado	✓	San Francisco	✓
Fresno	✓	San Joaquin	✓
Glenn	✓	San Luis Obispo	✓
Humboldt	✓	San Mateo	✓
Imperial	✓	Santa Barbara	✓
Inyo	✓	Santa Clara	✓
Kern	✓	Santa Cruz	✓
Kings	✓	Shasta	✓
Lake	✓	Sierra	✓
Lassen	✓	Siskiyou	✓
Los Angeles	✓	Solano	✓
Madera	✓	Sonoma	✓
Marin	✓	Stanislaus	✓
Mariposa	✓	Sutter	✓
Mendocino	✓	Tehama	✓
Merced	✓	Trinity	✓
Modoc	✓	Tulare	✓
Mono	✓	Tuolumne	✓
Monterey	✓	Ventura	✓
Napa	✓	Yolo	✓
Nevada	✓	Yuba	✓

Requirement 4: The types of trial court conferences, hearings, or proceedings in which remote technology was used

The Judicial Council administered a survey to collect data for Requirement 4. All 58 courts reported using remote technology in one or more of the following case types:

- family
- juvenile dependency
- juvenile delinquency
- limited civil
- probate
- small claims
- unlimited civil
- misdemeanor criminal
- felony criminal

Courts also reported using remote technology in proceedings in matters identified in Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(a)(1). Of the responding courts, 58 reported using remote technology in family cases, 55 courts reported using remote technology in juvenile dependency, 57 in juvenile delinquency, 57 in limited civil, 58 in unlimited civil cases, 57 in probate, 54 in small claims, 58 in unlimited civil, 57 in misdemeanor criminal cases, 56 in felony criminal cases, and 50 for other matters.⁷ Tables 5, 6, and 7 display for each responding court the case types for which remote technology was used.

Table 5. Remote Technology Use in Family, Juvenile Dependency and Delinquency, and Limited Civil Matters, by Court

County	Family	Juvenile Dependency	Juvenile Delinquency	Limited Civil
Alameda	✓	✓	✓	✓
Alpine	✓		✓	✓
Amador	✓	✓	✓	✓
Butte	✓	✓	✓	✓
Calaveras	✓	✓	✓	✓
Colusa	✓	✓	✓	✓
Contra Costa	✓	✓	✓	✓
Del Norte	✓	✓	✓	✓
El Dorado	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fresno	✓	✓	✓	✓
Glenn	✓	✓	✓	✓
Humboldt	✓	✓	✓	✓
Imperial	✓	✓	✓	✓
Inyo	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kern	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kings	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lake	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lassen	✓	✓	✓	✓

⁷ Proceedings in matters identified in Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(a)(1).

County	Family	Juvenile Dependency	Juvenile Delinquency	Limited Civil
Los Angeles	✓	✓	✓	✓
Madera	✓	✓	✓	✓
Marin	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mariposa	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mendocino	✓	✓	✓	✓
Merced	✓	✓	✓	✓
Modoc	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mono	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monterey	✓	✓	✓	✓
Napa	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nevada	✓	✓	✓	✓
Orange	✓	✓	✓	✓
Placer	✓	✓	✓	✓
Plumas	✓			✓
Riverside	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sacramento	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Benito	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Bernardino	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Diego	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Francisco	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Joaquin	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Luis Obispo	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Mateo	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Barbara	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Clara	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Cruz	✓	✓	✓	✓
Shasta	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sierra	✓	✓	✓	✓
Siskiyou	✓	✓	✓	✓
Solano	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sonoma	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stanislaus	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sutter	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tehama	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trinity	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tulare	✓	✓	✓	
Tuolumne	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ventura	✓	✓	✓	✓

County	Family	Juvenile Dependency	Juvenile Delinquency	Limited Civil
Yolo	✓		✓	✓
Yuba	✓	✓	✓	✓
Number of Courts	58	55	57	57
✓ Used remote technology. A blank cell indicates remote technology was not used.				

Table 6. Remote Technology Use in Probate, Small Claims, Unlimited Civil, and Other Matters, by Court

County	Probate	Small Claims	Unlimited Civil	Other Matters*
Alameda	✓	✓	✓	✓
Alpine	✓	✓	✓	✓
Amador	✓	✓	✓	✓
Butte	✓	✓	✓	✓
Calaveras	✓		✓	
Colusa	✓		✓	
Contra Costa	✓	✓	✓	✓
Del Norte	✓	✓	✓	✓
El Dorado	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fresno	✓	✓	✓	✓
Glenn	✓	✓	✓	✓
Humboldt	✓	✓	✓	✓
Imperial	✓	✓	✓	
Inyo	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kern	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kings	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lake	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lassen	✓	✓	✓	✓
Los Angeles	✓	✓	✓	✓
Madera	✓	✓	✓	✓
Marin	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mariposa	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mendocino	✓	✓	✓	✓
Merced	✓	✓	✓	✓
Modoc	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mono	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monterey	✓	✓	✓	✓
Napa	✓	✓	✓	✓

County	Probate	Small Claims	Unlimited Civil	Other Matters*
Nevada	✓	✓	✓	✓
Orange	✓	✓	✓	✓
Placer	✓	✓	✓	✓
Plumas			✓	
Riverside	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sacramento	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Benito	✓	✓	✓	
San Bernardino	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Diego	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Francisco	✓	✓	✓	
San Joaquin	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Luis Obispo	✓	✓	✓	✓
San Mateo	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Barbara	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Clara	✓	✓	✓	✓
Santa Cruz	✓	✓	✓	✓
Shasta	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sierra	✓	✓	✓	
Siskiyou	✓	✓	✓	✓
Solano	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sonoma	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stanislaus	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sutter	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tehama	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trinity	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tulare	✓		✓	
Tuolumne	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ventura	✓	✓	✓	✓
Yolo	✓	✓	✓	✓
Yuba	✓	✓	✓	✓
Number of Courts	57	54	58	50

* Proceedings in matters identified in Code of Civil Procedure section 367.76(a)(1).

✓ Used remote technology. A blank cell indicates remote technology was not used.

Table 7. Remote Technology Use in Misdemeanor Criminal and Felony Criminal Matters, by Court

County	Misdemeanor Criminal	Felony Criminal
Alameda	✓	✓
Alpine	✓	✓
Amador	✓	✓
Butte	✓	✓
Calaveras	✓	✓
Colusa		
Contra Costa	✓	✓
Del Norte	✓	
El Dorado	✓	✓
Fresno	✓	✓
Glenn	✓	✓
Humboldt	✓	✓
Imperial	✓	✓
Inyo	✓	✓
Kern	✓	✓
Kings	✓	✓
Lake	✓	✓
Lassen	✓	✓
Los Angeles	✓	✓
Madera	✓	✓
Marin	✓	✓
Mariposa	✓	✓
Mendocino	✓	✓
Merced	✓	✓
Modoc	✓	✓
Mono	✓	✓
Monterey	✓	✓
Napa	✓	✓
Nevada	✓	✓
Orange	✓	✓
Placer	✓	✓
Plumas	✓	✓
Riverside	✓	✓
Sacramento	✓	✓
San Benito	✓	✓
San Bernardino	✓	✓
San Diego	✓	✓

County	Misdemeanor Criminal	Felony Criminal
San Francisco	✓	✓
San Joaquin	✓	✓
San Luis Obispo	✓	✓
San Mateo	✓	✓
Santa Barbara	✓	✓
Santa Clara	✓	✓
Santa Cruz	✓	✓
Shasta	✓	✓
Sierra	✓	✓
Siskiyou	✓	✓
Solano	✓	✓
Sonoma	✓	✓
Stanislaus	✓	✓
Sutter	✓	✓
Tehama	✓	✓
Trinity	✓	✓
Tulare	✓	✓
Tuolumne	✓	✓
Ventura	✓	✓
Yolo	✓	✓
Yuba	✓	✓
Number of Courts	57	56

Requirement 5: The cost of purchasing, leasing, or upgrading remote technology

The Judicial Council administered a survey to collect data regarding the cost of purchasing, leasing, or upgrading remote technology. Collectively, courts reported spending \$77,825,524.72 to purchase, lease, or upgrade remote technology between September 1, 2024, and August 31, 2025. Eighteen of the 58 responding courts did not report expenditures for remote technology during this reporting period. Table 8 displays the amount each court spent to purchase, lease, or upgrade remote technology in the reporting period.

Table 8. Amount Spent to Purchase, Lease, or Upgrade Remote Technology, by Court

County	Amount Spent (\$)	County	Amount Spent (\$)
Alameda	\$1,158,392.48	Placer	498,553.00
Alpine	5,666.01	Plumas	10,500.00
Amador	48,000	Riverside	223,241.16
Butte	2,491,169.89	Sacramento	831,703.24
Calaveras	0	San Benito	0
Colusa	1,400.00	San Bernardino	1,854,699.04
Contra Costa	2,246,198.89	San Diego	222,814.05
Del Norte	50,000	San Francisco*	—
El Dorado	0	San Joaquin*	—
Fresno	417,770.00	San Luis Obispo	381,144
Glenn	0	San Mateo	7,049.68
Humboldt	67,000.00	Santa Barbara	54,108.75
Imperial	12,838	Santa Clara	7,800,000
Inyo	0	Santa Cruz	23,053
Kern	1,110,639.95	Shasta	0
Kings	800.00	Sierra*	—
Lake	0	Siskiyou	0
Lassen	7,717.88	Solano	96,724.52
Los Angeles	49,618,486.87	Sonoma*	—
Madera	7,685.64	Stanislaus*	—
Marin	0	Sutter	7,114.22
Mariposa	11,409.06	Tehama	0
Mendocino	22,296.00	Trinity	0
Merced	3,432.15	Tulare	2,677.49
Modoc	2,134.18	Tuolumne	3,674.97
Mono	40,000.00	Ventura	153,842.64
Monterey	345,025.55	Yolo	13,256.63
Napa	0	Yuba	858.27
Nevada	0	* Data unreported.	
Orange	7,972,447.51		

Requirement 6: The type of technology and equipment purchased or leased

Forty courts reported purchasing or leasing hardware, software, or licenses to support remote proceedings. Thirty-six courts reported purchasing or leasing hardware, such as computers, televisions, cameras, microphones, speakers, cables, and video and audio control systems; 20 courts reported purchasing or leasing software; and 17 courts reported purchasing or leasing licenses. Table 9 displays the types of technology or equipment purchased or leased by the trial courts during the reporting period.

Table 9. Types of Technology or Equipment Purchased or Leased, by Court

County	Hardware	Software	Licenses
Alameda	✓	✓	
Alpine	✓	✓	
Amador	✓	✓	✓
Butte	✓	✓	
Calaveras			
Colusa			✓
Contra Costa	✓	✓	✓
Del Norte	✓	✓	
El Dorado			
Fresno	✓		✓
Glenn			
Humboldt	✓	✓	✓
Imperial	✓		
Inyo			
Kern	✓	✓	✓
Kings			
Lake			
Lassen	✓		
Los Angeles	✓	✓	✓
Madera	✓		
Marin			
Mariposa	✓	✓	
Mendocino	✓		
Merced		✓	✓
Modoc	✓		
Mono	✓		
Monterey	✓		✓
Napa			
Nevada			

County	Hardware	Software	Licenses
Orange	✓		
Placer	✓	✓	✓
Plumas	✓		
Riverside	✓	✓	✓
Sacramento	✓		
San Benito			
San Bernardino	✓		
San Diego	✓	✓	✓
San Francisco*	—	—	—
San Joaquin*	—	—	—
San Luis Obispo			
San Mateo	✓		
Santa Barbara	✓	✓	
Santa Clara	✓	✓	✓
Santa Cruz	✓		
Shasta			
Sierra*	—	—	—
Siskiyou			
Solano	✓		
Sonoma*	—	—	—
Stanislaus*	—	—	—
Sutter		✓	✓
Tehama			
Trinity		✓	✓
Tulare	✓		
Tuolumne	✓		
Ventura	✓		✓
Yolo	✓	✓	
Yuba	✓		
Number of Courts	36	20	17
✓ Purchased or leased technology or equipment for remote proceedings. A blank cell indicates no purchase or lease was made for that technology type.			
* Data unreported.			

Requirement 7: Any other information necessary to evaluate the use of remote proceedings by courts


The Judicial Council collects data regarding overall user experience of the Zoom remote technology platform. Between September 1, 2024, and August 31, 2025, the Judicial Council collected 44,526 user responses. Of those, 43.7 percent were from court users and 56.3 percent were from court workers. Respondents were asked whether their experience using remote technology was positive or negative. Those who provided negative feedback were asked to give additional information about their experience. Table 10 displays the total feedback data collected for courts throughout the state using the Zoom platform.⁹

Table 10. Count and Percentages of Positive vs. Negative Remote Proceedings Experiences

Remote Proceedings Experience Response	Court Users	Court Workers	Total
Positive	17,454 (89.8%)	24,765 (98.7%)	42,219 (94.8%)
Negative	1,982 (10.2%)	325 (1.3%)	2,307 (5.2%)
Total	19,436	25,090	44,526

Figure 3 depicts the proportion of positive to negative experiences for both court users and court workers. Ten percent of responding court users reported a negative experience with their remote proceedings; 90 percent reported a positive experience. Similarly, 2 percent of responding internal court workers reported a negative experience with their remote proceedings; 98 percent reported a positive experience.

Figure 3. Positive vs. Negative Experiences Reported by Court Users and Court Workers



Given that the Superior Court of Los Angeles County uses their own custom-built remote technology platform, LA Court Connect (LACC), for remote proceedings in most case types, their data regarding overall user experiences comes from the LACC Remote Appearance survey,

⁹ The feedback data in Table 10 does not include the Superior Court of Los Angeles County because they do not use the Zoom remote technology platform for remote proceedings.

mentioned above. This survey asks respondents if their most recent remote proceeding experience was “good” or “bad.” Of the 8,913 external court users who responded to the survey from December 30, 2024, through August 31, 2025, 7,429 (83.4 percent) reported that their most recent remote hearing experience was “good” and 1,434 (16.6 percent) reported that their most recent remote hearing experience was “bad.”

Requirement 8: Certification of Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings

The Judicial Council administered a survey to collect data for Requirement 8. All but one of the 58 courts certified that their courtrooms where remote proceedings are conducted meet the minimum standards for courtroom technology necessary to permit remote participation in court proceedings. Table 11 displays whether a court has certified that it met minimum technology standards for remote proceedings.

Table 11. Court Certification of Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings

County	Meets minimum technology standards
Alameda ¹	✓
Alpine	✓
Amador	✓
Butte	✓
Calaveras	✓
Colusa	✓
Contra Costa	✓
Del Norte	✓
El Dorado	✓
Fresno	✓
Glenn	✓
Humboldt	✓
Imperial	✓
Inyo	✓
Kern	✓
Kings	✓
Lake	✓
Lassen	✓
Los Angeles	✓
Madera	✓
Marin	✓
Mariposa	✓
Mendocino	✓
Merced	✓

County	Meets minimum technology standards
Modoc	✓
Mono	✓
Monterey	✓
Napa	✓
Nevada	✓
Orange	✓
Placer	✓
Plumas	✓
Riverside ²	
Sacramento	✓
San Benito	✓
San Bernardino	✓
San Diego	✓
San Francisco	✓
San Joaquin	✓
San Luis Obispo	✓
San Mateo	✓
Santa Barbara	✓
Santa Clara	✓
Santa Cruz	✓
Shasta	✓
Sierra	✓
Siskiyou	✓
Solano	✓
Sonoma	✓
Stanislaus	✓
Sutter	✓
Tehama	✓
Trinity	✓
Tulare	✓
Tuolumne	✓
Ventura	✓

County	Meets minimum technology standards
Yolo	✓
Yuba	✓

¹ One courthouse designated for unlimited civil settlement conferences is equipped with laptops that have speakers and video capabilities for use when necessary. In criminal matters, remote proceedings are infrequent, though participants may occasionally use their own equipment. The court also has mobile equipment available for use when needed. In all instances, if the technology is not working, the proceeding will not proceed remotely.

² This court has basic technology available to permit remote participation in court proceedings to comply with *Minimum Technology Standards for Remote Proceedings*, including access to a hard-wired or other reliable high-speed internet connection, monitors, cameras, microphones, and speakers. The court will seek additional resources if needed and made available.