

# INTRODUCTION

The *Court Statistics Report (CSR)* is published annually by the Judicial Council of California. The CSR combines 10-year statewide summaries of Superior Court filings and dispositions with similar workload indicators for the California Supreme Court and Courts of Appeal. The appendixes to this report provide detailed information on filings and dispositions in the Superior Courts for the most recent fiscal year, 2015–2016.

The CSR is designed to fulfill the provisions of Article VI, Section 6 of the California Constitution, which requires the Judicial Council to survey the condition and business of the California Courts.

The CSR is published on the California Courts website at <http://www.courts.ca.gov/13421.htm>.

## Snapshot of Court Caseload

The *Court Statistics Report* contains essential information about the annual caseload of the California Judicial Branch, with a particular emphasis on the number and types of cases that are filed and disposed of in the courts. This information is submitted to the California Legislature and used in numerous Judicial Branch reports. As with any published data, the numbers in this report represent a snapshot of the most complete and reliable information available at the time of compilation.

To ensure that the statistics used for making policy decisions are as accurate as possible, courts may amend the data they submit to the Judicial Council should new, more detailed or more complete information become available. For this reason, the data in this report may change slightly over time as courts revise their calculations and submit new caseload estimates.

## Weighted Caseload and Court Workload

In the Judicial Branch the most reliable and consistent measure of workload is the number of case filings. Because different types of cases require different amounts of judicial and staff resources, a weighted caseload approach is the standard method, nationwide, to estimate the workload and resource needs of the courts. Accordingly, the Judicial Council has adopted a weighted caseload methodology to measure judicial and court staff resource needs in California. Weighted caseload distinguishes between different categories of filings so that the resources required to process a felony case, for example, are recognized as being much greater than the resources required to process a traffic infraction. Individual caseweights have been assigned to the many different types of cases filed in the courts. Caseweights are used along with the data published in the Court Statistics Report to estimate the number of judicial officers and court staff needed to fully adjudicate each case filed in the 58 Superior Courts.

The Judicial Council has adopted caseweights for two workload models used by the Judicial Branch—the Judicial Workload Assessment and the Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model. The Judicial Workload Assessment model was originally developed and adopted by the Judicial Council in 2001, and the Judicial Council adopted updated caseweights or judicial workload standards in 2012. The Resource Assessment Study (RAS) model was originally developed and adopted by the Judicial Council in 2005, and the RAS model was updated in 2016 and adopted by the Judicial Council in 2017.

With the introduction of a new budget development and allocation process for the trial courts in 2013, the data published in the Court Statistics Report is being used by the Judicial Branch for a critically important new purpose. The Judicial Council adopted the Workload-based Allocation and Funding Methodology, or WAFM, which uses the Resource Assessment Model (RAS) and other workload factors in a new budget development process that alters baseline funding for most trial courts based on court workload. WAFM is consistent with Goal II, Independence and Accountability, of Justice in Focus: The Strategic Plan for California Judicial Branch 2006-2012, in that the methodology strives to “allocate resources in a transparent and fair manner that promotes efficiency and effectiveness in the administration of justice, supports the strategic goals of the Judicial Branch, promotes innovation, and provides for effective and consistent court operations” (Goal II.B.3).

## Variations in Data Totals

Statewide trends in filings and dispositions may be influenced by a number of factors. For example, changes in the number of filings and dispositions may reflect shifting needs or behavior of residents of a court’s service area as well as new policy emphases in the work of justice system partners. The following are some of the more common causes of statistical variations.

### Missing Data

Statewide totals in the *CSR* may be influenced by missing data for certain courts. Typically, when courts do not report data to the Judicial Council, it is because they have encountered difficulties generating automated reports from their case management systems. Filings data submitted by the courts tend to be more complete than disposition data.

### Incomplete Data

The reporting of incomplete data typically occurs when courts transmit partial data totals for a particular case type because of the limits of their case management systems. It should be noted that incomplete data are more difficult to spot in the tables that follow, but in general they will cause downward shifts in the number of filings and dispositions. (Incomplete data for FY 2015–2016 are also detailed in Appendix A.)

## Variation in Local Business Practices

Data reported in the *CSR* are compiled in a data warehouse, the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Because many different case management systems are used in the courts, data must be “mapped” from local systems into the standard categories used for reporting purposes. One essential function of JBSIS is to standardize the basic definitions of case types and case events across all courts in California. Another important aspect of JBSIS is its role in the extraction of court data through different transmission methods that include manual reports, web-based reports through the JBSIS Portal, and automated JBSIS reports. Through this process JBSIS contributes to the warehousing of this data in a structure that is comparable from one court to another.


Maintaining quality control over the data contained in the JBSIS data warehouse involves:

- Training court staff on the standards for the classification, entry, and reporting of data;
- Providing information to the courts for resolving technical questions associated with data definitions, processing, and aggregation;
- Developing and adopting a new case management system infrastructure in the courts; and
- Documenting and disseminating information related to changes in the ways that courts define or report data.

Although a growing number of courts now transmit their data electronically from their case management system to the Judicial Council, there continue to be differences among Superior Courts' case processing and other business practices that reflect the histories of individual courts and the unique needs of the communities they serve. These differences may influence the ways in which Superior Courts report data to the Judicial Council. On that basis, while the filings and disposition data reported by any one court are largely comparable to data from other courts, some local variations in the classification and reporting of cases still occur.

## Changes to 2017 Court Statistics Report

The 2017 *Court Statistics Report* reflects several design improvements and organizational changes to make the document more user-friendly—primarily a more graphical presentation of the material and more accurate organization of the work of the branch by case type and subject matter. The electronic PDF version of the 2017 CSR also offers access to the raw data underlying many of the graphical charts by clicking the data icon:



The major organizational change in the 2017 CSR is to distinguish descriptive caseload indicators such as filings and dispositions, and basic standards and measures of judicial administration. These measures, such as time to disposition and caseload clearance rate, allow the courts to assess case-processing practices and ensure efficient allocation of resources. Engaging in an ongoing assessment of performance measurement furthers many of the branchwide strategic goals—such as access to justice, accountability, and quality of justice and service to the public—that are vital to the effective administration of justice in California.

### Judicial Administration Standards and Measures

Government Code Section 77001.5 (Sen. Bill 56 [Dunn]; Stats. 2006, ch. 390) requires the Judicial Council to adopt and annually report on “judicial administration standards and measures that promote the fair and efficient administration of justice, including, but not limited to, the following subjects: (1) providing equal access to courts and respectful treatment for all court participants; (2) case processing, including the efficient use of judicial resources; and (3) general court administration.” The judicial administration standards and measures included in the 2017 CSR further the branch’s commitment to the goals and measures outlined in Government Code Section 77001.5.

### CalCourTools

CalCourTools is a set of judicial administration standards and measures linked to technical assistance available from the Judicial Council. The CalCourTools program builds on the CourTools measures developed by the National Center for State Courts and endorsed by the Conference of Chief Justices and the Conference of State Court Administrators.

## Statistical Overview

This section contains summaries of filings and dispositions for the California Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and Superior Courts for fiscal year 2015–2016.

### Supreme Court

- The Supreme Court issued 76 written opinions during the year.

- 8,079 matters were filed with the court, with 7,946 matters disposed of during the same period.
- The court received 4,193 petitions seeking review from a Court of Appeal decision in an appeal or an original writ proceeding and disposed of 3,860 such petitions.
  - 1,083 of these petitions for review arose from civil matters, and 3,110 from criminal matters.
  - The court disposed of 1,079 civil petitions and 2,781 criminal petitions.
- The court received 2,804 petitions seeking original writ relief and disposed of 3,013 of such petitions.
  - Of the petitions seeking original writ relief, 288 arose out of civil matters and 2,516 arose out of criminal matters.
  - The court disposed of 308 civil and 2,705 criminal petitions.
- A total of 8 automatic appeals were filed with the court following a judgment of death, and the court disposed of 23 automatic appeals by written opinion.
- The court received 43 habeas corpus petitions related to automatic appeals and disposed of 21 such petitions.
- A total of 1,031 State Bar matters were filed with the court, and 1,029 such matters were disposed of during the year.
- The Supreme Court ordered 17 Court of Appeal opinions depublished in this fiscal year.

### **Courts of Appeal**

- Contested matters for the Courts of Appeal totaled 20,217, and dispositions totaled 22,931.
- Contested matters included 13,296 records of appeal and 6,921 original proceedings.
- The 13,296 filings of records of appeal comprised 3,840 civil cases, 6,523 criminal cases, and 2,933 juvenile cases. The 6,921 filings of original proceedings included 1,781 civil, 4,791 criminal, and 349 juvenile cases.
- Filings of notices of appeal in the Superior Court totaled 15,674: 5,935 civil cases, 6,714 criminal cases, and 3,025 juvenile cases.
- Disposition of notices of appeal totaled 16,012 and included 5,945 civil, 7,064 criminal, and 3,003 juvenile cases.
  - Dispositions of notices of appeal by written opinion totaled 9,967: 2,917 civil cases, 5,526 criminal cases, and 1,524 juvenile cases.
  - Dispositions without written opinion totaled 4,000 cases: 1,353 civil, 1,274 criminal, and 1,373 juvenile.
  - Dispositions of notices of appeal with no record filed totaled 2,045 cases: 1,675 civil, 264 criminal, and 106 juvenile.
- Disposition of filings of original proceedings is composed of 1,788 civil, 4,922 criminal, and 300 juvenile cases.
  - Disposition of original proceedings decided with written opinion totaled 420 cases: 98 civil cases, 127 criminal cases, and 195 juvenile cases.
  - Disposition of original proceedings without written opinion totaled 6,590 cases: 1,690 civil, 4,795 criminal, and 105 juvenile.
- Of the cases disposed of by written opinion, 8,269 were affirmed, 1,038 were reversed, and 278 were dismissed.

- Of those cases affirmed by the Courts of Appeal, 6,759 received full affirmance, while 1,510 received affirmance with modification.
- Statewide, 8 percent of Court of Appeal majority opinions were published in this fiscal year.

## Superior Court

Superior Court case filings across all case categories totaled 6,217,800 cases, while dispositions numbered 5,488,909. Within these aggregate numbers, the following totals by major case category and case type were recorded:

**Civil Cases.** Civil filings totaled 712,299 and civil dispositions totaled 676,074, with a caseload clearance rate of 95% attained over all civil case types in this fiscal year.

- **UNLIMITED:** Civil unlimited filings totaled 201,390 cases, while civil unlimited dispositions numbered 182,679.
  - Method of disposition for civil unlimited cases: 145,044 cases disposed of before trial and 37,237 after trial.
  - Caseload clearance rate for civil unlimited cases: 91%.
  - Case processing time for civil unlimited cases was 64% within 12 months, 76% in 18 months, and 83% in 24 months.
- **LIMITED:** Civil limited filings totaled 352,562 cases, while civil limited dispositions numbered 342,553.
  - Method of disposition for civil limited trials: 316,806 cases were disposed of before trial and 25,465 after trial.
  - The caseload clearance rate for civil limited cases was 97%.
  - Case processing time for civil limited was as follows: 82% in 12 months, 90% in 18 months, and 93% in 24 months.
- **SMALL CLAIMS:** Small claims filings reached a total of 158,347 cases, while small claims dispositions numbered 150,842.
  - Method of disposition for small claims cases: 63,383 cases were disposed of before trial and 87,459 after trial.
  - The caseload clearance rate for small claims cases was 95%.
  - Case processing time in small claims cases was as follows: 59% in 70 days, 72% in 90 days.

**Criminal Cases.** Criminal filings totaled 4,946,881 and criminal dispositions numbered 4,367,828, with a caseload clearance rate of 88% attained over all criminal case types in this fiscal year.

- **FELONIES:** Felony filings reached a total of 200,200 cases, while felony dispositions numbered 185,033.
  - Method of disposition: 177,111 felony cases were disposed of before trial and 5,139 after trial.
  - Caseload clearance rate for felony cases was 92%.
  - Case processing time in felony cases resulting in bindovers or certified pleas: 43% in 30 days, 54% in 45 days, 71% in 90 days—with 85% of all felonies disposed of in less than 12 months.

- **MISDEMEANORS:** Misdemeanor filings reached a total of 841,716 cases, while misdemeanor dispositions numbered 639,514.
  - Method of disposition: 630,381 misdemeanor cases were disposed of before trial and 6,542 after trial.
  - Caseload clearance rate for misdemeanor cases ranged from 74% for nontraffic misdemeanors to 79% for traffic misdemeanors.
  - Case processing time for misdemeanors: 57% in 30 days, 74% in 90 days, and 80% in 120 days.
- **INFRACTIONS:** Infraction filings reached a total of 3,904,965 cases, while infraction dispositions numbered 3,543,281.
  - Method of disposition: 3,200,923 infraction cases were disposed of before trial and 332,498 after trial.
  - The caseload clearance rate for infraction cases ranged from 64% for nontraffic infractions to 92% for traffic infractions.

**Family Law.** Family law filings totaled 387,849, and family law dispositions numbered 319,777, with a caseload clearance rate of 82% attained over all family law case types in this fiscal year.

- **FAMILY LAW (MARITAL):** Family law (marital) filings reached a total of 138,520 cases, while this type of family law dispositions numbered 130,286.
  - Method of disposition: 128,764 family law (marital) cases were disposed of before trial and 1,522 after trial.
  - The caseload clearance rate for family law (marital) cases was 94%.
- **FAMILY LAW PETITIONS:** Family law petition filings reached a total of 249,329 cases, while this type of family law dispositions numbered 189,327.
  - Method of disposition: 187,293 family law petition cases were disposed of before trial and 2,034 after trial.
  - The caseload clearance rate for family law petition cases was 76%.

**Juvenile Law.** Juvenile filings totaled 78,961, and juvenile dispositions numbered 60,862.

- **JUVENILE DELINQUENCY:** Juvenile delinquency filings reached a total of 35,287 cases, while juvenile delinquency dispositions numbered 30,258.
  - Method of disposition: 5,191 juvenile delinquency cases were disposed of before hearing and 25,067 after hearing.
  - The caseload clearance rate for juvenile delinquency cases ranged from 89% for original petitions to 78% for subsequent petitions, with an average of 86% for this case type.
- **JUVENILE DEPENDENCY:** Juvenile dependency filings reached a total of 43,674 cases, while juvenile dependency dispositions numbered 30,604.
  - Method of disposition: 1,338 juvenile dependency cases were disposed of before hearing and 29,266 after hearing.
  - The caseload clearance rate for juvenile dependency cases ranged from 77% for original petitions to 27% for subsequent petitions, with an average of 70% for this case type.

### ***Probate and Mental Health Cases.***

- PROBATE: Probate (estate, guardianship, and conservatorship) filings reached a total of 47,170 cases, while probate dispositions numbered 26,827.
  - Method of disposition: 15,349 probate cases were disposed of before hearing and 11,452 after hearing.
  - The caseload clearance rate for all types of probate cases was 57%.
- MENTAL HEALTH: Mental health filings reached a total of 33,154 cases, while mental health dispositions numbered 27,151.
  - Method of disposition: 5,742 mental health cases were disposed of before hearing and 21,407 after hearing.
  - The caseload clearance rate for all types of mental health cases was 82%.

### ***Trials, By Type of Proceeding***

- JURY TRIALS: A total of 9,279 jury trials were recorded across all case types. Jury trials held in the Superior Courts in fiscal year 2015–2016 included 4,822 felony, 3,056 misdemeanor, 1,142 civil unlimited, 232 civil limited, and 27 probate and mental health cases.
- ALL COURT TRIALS: A total of 427,276 court trials were recorded across all the case types detailed above (excluding small claims). These included 317 felony, 335,984 misdemeanor and infractions, 32,910 civil unlimited, 25,233 civil limited, and 32,832 probate and mental health cases.
- SMALL CLAIMS TRIALS: A total of 87,459 small claims court trials were recorded, which may be distinguished from criminal and civil court trials for their tendency to be resolved in a single hearing.

### ***Trial Court Workload and Judicial Resources***

- Authorized judicial positions in the California Courts in fiscal year 2015–2016 totaled 2,013: 1,726 judges and 287 subordinate judicial officers.
- The 50 new judgeships authorized by Assembly Bill 159, effective January 2008, are still unfunded but are included in the statewide number of judgeships.
- While the number of authorized judicial positions for the year was 2,013, the assessed number of judges needed (AJN) was 2,049 based on the 2016 assessment presented to the Judicial Council at the October 2016 meeting.

## **The California Court System**

California's court system serves a population of more than 39 million people—about 12 percent of the total U.S. population—and processed about 6.2 million cases in fiscal year 2015–2016. The Judicial Branch budget for the 2015-2016 fiscal year excluding infrastructure of \$3.5 billion represents about 2.4 percent of the California state budget and makes possible the case-processing activity detailed above while also providing the basis of support for approximately 2,000 judicial officers and 19,000 Judicial Branch employees statewide.

The vast majority of cases in the California Courts begin in one of the 58 superior, or trial, courts, which reside in each of the state's 58 counties. With more than 500 court buildings throughout the state, these courts hear both civil and criminal cases as well as family, probate, mental health, and juvenile cases. The equivalent of

more than 2,000 judicial positions statewide address the full range of cases heard each year by the Superior Courts, as reflected in the sheer number of case filings and dispositions reported here. The Superior Courts report summaries of their case filing counts to the Judicial Council, and the CSR reports those figures here in aggregate form.

The next level of court authority within the state's Judicial Branch resides with the Courts of Appeal. Most of the cases that come before the Courts of Appeal involve the review of a Superior Court decision that is being contested by a party to the case. The Legislature has divided the state geographically into six appellate districts, each containing a Court of Appeal. Currently, 105 appellate justices preside in nine locations in the state to hear matters brought for review. Totals of Court of Appeal case filings are forwarded to the Judicial Council; these are summarized in the tables that follow.

The Supreme Court sits at the apex of the state's judicial system, and has discretion to review decisions of the Courts of Appeal in order to settle important questions of law and resolve conflicts among the courts of appeal. Although the Supreme Court generally has considerable discretion in determining in which cases to grant review, it must review the appeal in any case in which a trial court has imposed the death penalty. The Supreme Court sends the Judicial Council its annual case filing figures, which are reported here in summary form.

## Terminology and Rules for Counting Filings

Technical definitions of most terms used in this CSR can be found in the appendixes. Some core definitions are presented here in more detail.

### Appellate Courts

**APPEAL.** An *appeal* is a proceeding undertaken to have a decision of a lower trial court reviewed by a court with appellate authority over the matter. (Certain limited matters are reviewed by the appellate department of the Superior Courts.) A *notice of appeal* is a written notification filed in the Superior Court to initiate the appeal of a judgment to the Court of Appeal. The Courts of Appeal have appellate jurisdiction in all trial court matters, except when a judgment of death is entered, in which case the Supreme Court has appellate jurisdiction. If the matter is appealable, the court must hear the appeal. A *fully briefed* appeal is one in which all briefs have been filed with the court. *Dismissal* of an appeal involves the termination of a case for reasons other than its merit. An appeal that is awaiting a final decision is said to be *pending*. **Each notice of appeal is counted as one new filing.**

**PETITION FOR REVIEW.** A *petition for review* is filed in the California Supreme Court to ask that court to exercise its discretion to review a decision issued by a Court of Appeal in an appeal or an original proceeding. The Supreme Court has a total of 90 days to consider a petition for review, after which it loses jurisdiction. If a petition for review is granted by the Supreme Court then full briefing occurs on the case; if a petition is denied then the judgment of the lower court becomes final as to the case.

**AUTOMATIC APPEAL.** An *automatic appeal* is the appeal following a judgment of death in the trial court. This type of appeal is unique because it moves directly from a Superior Court to the Supreme Court without first being reviewed by a Court of Appeal. Like other types of appeals, is fully briefed before being heard. **An automatic appeal is counted as one new filing.**

**ORIGINAL PROCEEDING.** An *original proceeding* is an action that may be filed and heard for the first time in an appellate court. This action is not an appeal; rather, it is ordinarily a petition for a writ. Examples of original



proceedings include a writ of mandamus, which instructs a lower court to perform mandatory duties correctly; a writ of prohibition, or an order that forbids certain actions; and a writ of habeas corpus, which is described below. **Each original proceeding is counted as one new filing.**

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS. A petition for the issuance of a *writ of habeas corpus* is typically filed to contest the legality of a party's imprisonment or conditions of confinement. **Each habeas corpus petition is counted as one new filing.**

WRITTEN OPINION. A *written opinion* is a document issued by an appellate court explaining the terms and reasoning in its disposition of a case. The written opinion includes a statement of the legal facts in the case, relevant points of law, and the court's analysis and rationale for its decision. In addition to the written majority opinion in a case, concurring and dissenting opinions also may be filed in each case. **For each case, only the majority opinion is counted as a written opinion in these tables.**

DISPOSITIONS. The appellate court may dispose of a case by affirming or reversing the action of the lower court, or it may send the case back to the lower court for further proceedings if appropriate.

RECORD OF APPEAL. A *record of appeal* is the compilation of documents and transcripts associated with a given Superior Court case under review by an appellate court. The record is a component of a new appellate case and as such **is not counted separately from the initial appeal.**

REVERSAL OF CASE DECISION. A *reversal* is the overturning of a lower court's decision by an appellate court.

## Superior Courts

FILING. In the most general sense, a *filing* is the initiation of a legal action with the court through a carefully prescribed legal procedure.

***How Filings Are Counted.*** The procedure used to count filings for this report follows a set of rules consistent with national standards for statistical reporting. These rules differ according to case type:

- Each filing in a *civil* case pertains to the complaint or petition that has been submitted to the court for action. A given civil complaint may name one or more individuals or groups as its object. However, **regardless of the number of parties named in a case, each civil case is reported as one filing or one disposition.**
- Each filing in a *criminal* case is associated with a single defendant against whom criminal charges have been filed. Multiple criminal charges may occur in a case where different charges have been brought against the same defendant, but **only the single most severe charge against a defendant in a given case is counted as a new criminal filing. When multiple defendants are charged with a crime, multiple filings are reported.**
- Each filing in a *juvenile* case pertains to a minor who is the subject of a petition made to the court for adjudication. A minor may have an initial filing that brought him or her to the attention of the court, and subsequent filings if new petitions or charges are filed over time. This practice continues until termination of the dependency or delinquency jurisdiction by the court or when the minor has reached the legal definition of adulthood. **In a single case involving multiple minors, each minor is counted as a separate filing.**

DISPOSITION. In a general sense, a *disposition* may be described as a final settlement or determination in a case. A disposition may occur either before or after a civil or criminal case has been scheduled for trial. A final judgment, a dismissal of a case, and the sentencing of a criminal defendant are all examples of dispositions. In

certain case types, however, a disposition may merely signal the beginning of the court's authority over a case. For example, after the petition to appoint a conservator is disposed of in conservatorship cases, the court assumes control over that case. Rules for counting and reporting dispositions mirror those for filings, although a case filed in one year may be disposed of by the court in a subsequent year.

## California Judicial Branch: Structure and Duties

### The Courts

#### CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT

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

- Has discretionary authority to review decisions of the Courts of Appeal; jurisdiction to review original petitions for writ relief; direct responsibility for automatic appeals after death penalty judgments
- Hears oral arguments in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Sacramento

#### COURTS OF APPEAL

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

- Review the majority of appealable orders or judgments from the Superior Courts; jurisdiction to review original petitions for writ relief
- Six districts, 19 divisions, 9 court locations

#### SUPERIOR COURTS

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

- Have trial jurisdiction over all criminal and civil cases filed in their respective counties; guided by state and local laws that define crimes and specify punishments, as well as defining civil duties and liabilities
- A total of 58 courts—one for each California county—each operating in 1 to 46 branches depending on county population, total local caseload, and other factors

### Branch and Administration Policy

#### JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA

[www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-jc.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/policyadmin-jc.htm)

The constitutionally created policymaking body of the California Courts

### Branch Agencies

#### COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS

[www.courts.ca.gov/5367.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/5367.htm)

Confirms gubernatorial appointments to the Supreme Court and appellate courts

#### COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE

<http://cjp.ca.gov>

Responsible for maintaining statewide standards for administration of justice and empowered with disciplinary authority to effect the censure, removal, retirement, or private admonishment of judges and commissioners

Decisions subject to review by the California Supreme Court

HABEAS CORPUS RESOURCE CENTER

[www.courts.ca.gov/5361.htm](http://www.courts.ca.gov/5361.htm)

Handles state and federal habeas corpus proceedings; provides training and support for private attorneys who take these cases

**Related**

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

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

Serves the Supreme Court in administrative and disciplinary matters related to attorneys