SUPERIOR COURT COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO 247 West Third Street, Eleventh Floor San Bernardino, CA 92415-0302

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO

IN RE:)
CIVIL JURY TRIALS	GENERAL ORDER OF THE PRESIDING JUDGE

On March 4, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom proclaimed a state of emergency in California as a result of COVID-19. On March 13, 2020, President Trump declared a national emergency which continues unabated. Since declaring the state of emergency, Governor Newsom and state and county public health officials have issued additional guidelines targeted at limiting the spread of COVID-19.

On March 19, 2020, Governor Newsom issued an Executive Order, and the state Public Health Officer issued a Public Health Order, instructing all individuals living in the state to stay home or at their place of residence, except as needed to facilitate authorized, necessary activities or to maintain the continuity of operations of critical infrastructure sectors. Governor Newsom and state public health officials have also prohibited most types of mass gatherings. Federal, state, and local public health officials have mandated that persons gathered with individuals who are not members of

GENERAL ORDER RE CIVIL JURY TRIALS

1 | t | 2 | ii | 3 | V | 4 | C | 5 | p

the same residence must implement social distancing of at least 6 feet between individuals. They have also determined that people over 65 years old, smokers, people with compromised immune systems, and people who have serious chronic medical conditions are at higher risk of contracting COVID-19. Therefore, they recommend that people at higher risk avoid leaving their homes.

In early May Governor Newsom and the state Public Health Officer introduced a Pandemic Resilience Roadmap. On May 7, 2020, the State Public Health Officer announced that statewide data supported the gradual movement of the entire state into Stage 2 of the Pandemic Resilience Roadmap. On May 18, 2020, the Governor outlined a process where counties that met specific criteria could move more quickly than other parts of the state through Stage 2 of modifying the Stay-at-Home order. San Bernardino County availed itself of that process, and on May 23, 2020, the state approved the County's request to reopen businesses in accordance with the Pandemic Resilience Roadmap.

Unfortunately, after the state permitted many counties to resume business operations, the number of confirmed COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations in the state increased significantly. Initially, the state attempted to address the rapidly escalating number of COVID-19 cases on a county-by county basis. On June 28, 2020, the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) issued guidance setting forth the need to close bars and similar establishments in counties that had been on the County Monitoring List, which included counties that showed concerning levels of disease transmission, hospitalizations, insufficient testing, or other critical epidemiological markers, for 14 days. San Bernardino County was included on that list, and it is still included among the list of counties that the state is closely monitoring.

On July 1, 2020, CDPH issued guidance specific to counties on the County

Monitoring List — including San Bernardino County— requiring closure of the indoor operations of various sectors, including restaurants, wineries, and certain entertainment venues. Despite the state's efforts to manage the continuing escalation of COVID-19

cases on a countywide basis, the numbers continued to rise causing the state Public Health Officer to issue an order on July 13, 2020 mandating statewide closure of some types of businesses, and/or imposing operational restrictions for other types of businesses. On March 17, 2020, when the court restricted its operations due to the pandemic, there were five confirmed COVID-19 cases in San Bernardino County. The court resumed operations on May 29, 2020. However, as of August 28, 2020, there have been 46,892 confirmed COVID-19 cases and 716 deaths attributed to COVID-19 in San Bernardino County.

The continuing escalation in the number of COVID-19 cases in San Bernardino County continues to impact the court's ability to provide adequate access to court services and proceedings while it contemporaneously implements appropriate measures to protect the health and safety of judicial officers, court staff, litigants, defendants, and members of the public. The court has found that it continues to be unsafe to conduct in-person proceedings that would require convening large groups of people, including parties, judicial officers, court staff, law enforcement, attorneys, witnesses, jurors, the public, and others.

Now that the court has resumed operations, it is experiencing substantial practical challenges associated with processing cases, scheduling and managing trials and other proceedings, and performing other functions associated with court operations. Despite the court's best planning efforts, due to social distancing and enhanced sanitization requirements, there exists inadequate facility space to convene jurors, and to conduct trials and other proceedings at the pre-pandemic rate of operation.

Courthouses are not designed to facilitate social distancing given their fixed configuration. Changing that configuration has security implications, affects the presentation of evidence, limits public access, and requires financial and other resources that the court lacks in light of reductions in its 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 fiscal year budgets. The court is also experiencing challenges with maintaining

adequate staff to conduct court operations as staff are unavailable for work due to selfquarantine based on membership in the group that has been identified as being at particularly high risk of contracting COVID-19, caregiving needs for children who out of school, or other reasons associated with this pandemic.

Moreover, while the court accelerated its plans to implement technology to allow judicial officers to conduct proceedings remotely, for legal and equitable reasons, it cannot mandate remote appearances in every case. Specifically, the court cannot mandate remote appearances in criminal jury trials because California Rules of Court (CRC) emergency rules 3 and 5 authorize remote proceedings only with the consent of the defendant. The court cannot mandate remote appearances in civil jury trials due to logistical and social distancing concerns that would arise with respect to jury selection and jury deliberations. There are also evidentiary issues that prevent the court from imposing mandatory remote civil jury trials.

One of the most important principles of our constitutional democracy is the right of persons accused of a crime to have a speedy trial. Preserving that right while protecting the well-being of all participants in a trial during a pandemic involving a highly contagious respiratory virus is an unprecedented challenge for trial courts. There are currently a significant number of felony and misdemeanor cases for which the court must devote its resources in order to meet Constitutional and statutory timelines. While Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye has granted the court's requests for emergency orders extending time to conduct criminal trials, the court is still experiencing substantial difficulty in marshalling the human resources and facility space needed to bring those matters to trial, particularly as new cases are filed daily.

Therefore, pursuant to Penal Code section 1050, the court will give preference and priority for available jurors and jury trials to criminal cases. Jury trials will be limited to those cases requiring a disposition within specific periods of time. Those cases include all criminal cases, unlawful detainer jury trials, civil cases with statutory preference under the California Code of Civil Procedure sections 35-37, and civil cases

approaching the 5-year deadline under California Code of Civil Procedure sections 583.310 and 583.320.

Based on the foregoing, the court finds and concludes that conducting civil jury trials could likely place prospective jurors, litigants, attorneys, and court personnel at unnecessary risk and that risk outweighs the interests of the public and the parties in a trial. Additionally, due to Constitutional and statutory time requirements, the court finds and concludes that in most instances criminal trials have priority over civil trials. Therefore, the court finds good cause to implement the authority granted to it under California Rule of Court, Rule 10.603; case authority recognizing the court's broad powers to insure the orderly administration of justice (see e.g., Walker v Superior Court (1991) 53 Cal.3d 257, 266-267); Chief Justice Tani G. Cantil-Sakauye's March 30, 2020 and April 29, 2020 Statewide Orders; the Chief Justice's August 13, 2020 Emergency Order; and Government Code Section 68115, and HEREBY ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

All civil jury trials are continued until further notice. The parties are asked to meet and confer to pick a tentative trial date some time in 2021, and to submit a stipulation to the court. If no stipulation is submitted, new trial dates will be selected at the current trial readiness conference. The court will not set any civil jury trials to commence before January 2021.

Pursuant to Penal Code section 1050, the court will give preference and priority for available jurors and jury trials to criminal cases. Civil jury trials will be limited to those cases requiring a disposition within specific periods of time. Those cases include all criminal cases, unlawful detainer jury trials, civil cases with statutory preference under the California Code of Civil Procedure sections 35-37, and civil cases approaching the 5-year deadline under California Code of Civil Procedure sections 583.310 and 583.320. The court may conduct a civil jury trial for cases that do not require disposition within a specific period of time at an earlier date, upon a finding of good cause shown, or through the uses of remote technology, when appropriate, and if feasible.

This order is effective immediately and it supercedes the court's August 18, 2020 implementation order extending dates for trials and preliminary examinations only as it relates to trial dates for civil jury trials. All other orders contained in the August 18, 2020 implementation order extending dates for trials and preliminary examinations remain effective until they are rescinded, amended, superceded by subsequent orders, or expire by the terms set forth in the order.

THIS ORDER IS EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY.

Dated: September 9, 2020

MICHAEL A. SACHS

Presiding Judge of the Superior Court