Judicial Council *of* California

R E P O R T T O T H E J U D I C I A L C O U N C I L

Item No.: *23-093*
For business meeting on May 12, 2023

Title
Judicial Branch Administration: Release of Demographic Data on California Justices and Judges

Submitted by
Judicial Council staff
Leah Rose-Goodwin, Chief Data and
    Analytics Officer
Kristin Greenaway, Supervising Analyst
Office of Court Research, Business
    Management Services

Agenda Item Type
Information Only

Date of Report
March 15, 2023

Contact
David Smith, 415-865-7696
    david.smith@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

This informational report to the Judicial Council contains aggregate demographic information concerning the gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, and disability status of California's justices and judges by specific jurisdiction, as required by Government Code section 12011.5(n). In accordance with this legislative mandate, the Judicial Council's Office of Court Research (OCR) has collected and released demographic information provided by responding justices and judges on March 1, 2023. In general, findings indicate that the California bench has become more diverse over time.

Relevant Previous Council Action

In 2006, Senate Bill 56 (Dunn) authorized 50 new judgeships in California and amended Government Code section 12011.5(n) to require the Judicial Council to collect and report on the demographics of the bench in the aggregate. The council has collected and released this demographic data since 2007, with the most recent information release occurring on March 1, 2023. Currently, section 12011.5(n) requires that the council report on the composition of the bench by race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, and disability status. Data pertaining to veteran and disability status has been collected since 2014, as a result

of an expansion of the legislative mandate for the collection of demographic data from new justices and judges. Similar reporting requirements apply to the Governor and the Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation of the State Bar of California.

Analysis/Rationale

The information in the attached charts reflects justices and judges on the bench as of December 31, 2022 who have reported demographic background information. In general, findings indicate that the California bench has become more diverse over time.

The charts show:

- The overall gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender identity of responding justices and judges in the Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal, and trial courts;
- The gender of these justices and judges by jurisdiction (Supreme Court, Courts of Appeal by district, and trial courts by county);
- The race/ethnicity of responding justices and judges by jurisdiction;
- The specific race/ethnicity reported by those justices and judges who indicated that they consider themselves to be of more than one race/ethnicity;
- The sexual orientation and gender identity of responding justices and judges by jurisdiction;
- The veteran status and disability status of responding judicial officers new to the bench, beginning in calendar year 2014; and
- Comparisons of the current overall data on gender, race, and ethnicity with data from prior years' reports.

The most recent demographic data reflect changes resulting from judicial retirements and other departures from the bench, new judicial appointments, and an increase in the number of trial court judges who have provided race/ethnicity information.

The demographic data indicate a trend toward a greater proportion of women serving as trial court judges over time. At the end of calendar year 2022, women responding to the demographics survey represented 39.9 percent of this component of the judiciary, compared to 27.1 percent at the end of 2006, continuing an upward trend across this time period.

The data also show an increase in the total number of responding judges since 2006 in the following race/ethnicity categories: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Pacific Islander, and more recently in the category of More than One Race. In addition to increases in the foregoing categories, a steady decrease was observed among judges in the response categories of White and Information Not Provided.

Of the 831 trial court judges responding to the question about their veteran status, 52 respondents (6 percent) indicated that they served in the military. Further, of the 834 judges responding to the question concerning their disability status, 19 judges (2 percent) indicated that they have a disability. Finally, 1,357 judicial officers responded to the question regarding their sexual orientation and gender identity, with the majority of respondents answering that they are

heterosexual (75.4 percent). The Judicial Council has released this data by posting the information on the California Courts website at *www.courts.ca.gov/13418.htm*.

Fiscal Impact and Policy Implications

There are no costs to the courts for the annual collection and release of demographic data on justices and judges. The release of this descriptive information is in response to a legislative mandate for descriptive demographic data, and on that basis is not intended to directly impact state or council policy.

Attachments and Links

1. Attachment A: Demographic data tables on gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, veteran status, and disability status of California justices and judges.

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, 2022[1]

Gender

Court	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	37	42.0%	51	58.0%	88	100.0%
Trial Court	635	39.7%	963	60.3%	1,598	100.0%
Total	**676**	**39.9%**	**1,017**	**60.1%**	**1,693**	**100.0%**

Race/Ethnicity[2]

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[3]		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided[4]		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	0	0.0%	5	5.7%	8	9.1%	8	9.1%	0	0.0%	62	70.5%	2	2.3%	3	3.4%	0	0.0%	88	100.0%
Trial Court	7	0.4%	151	9.4%	136	8.5%	202	12.6%	6	0.4%	976	61.1%	16	1.0%	72	4.5%	32	2.0%	1,598	100.0%
Total	**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%**

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2022. 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, 2022.

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 23 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, 2022[1]

Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation

Court	Heterosexual		Lesbian		Gay		Bisexual		Transgender		Information Not Provided[2]		Total Respondents[3]	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	73	83.0%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	14.8%	88	100.0%
Trial Court	1,198	75.0%	29	1.8%	42	2.6%	4	0.3%	2	0.1%	323	20.2%	1,598	100.0%
Total	**1,277**	**75.4%**	**30**	**1.8%**	**44**	**2.6%**	**4**	**0.2%**	**2**	**0.1%**	**336**	**19.8%**	**1,693**	**100.0%**

1. The tabled data reflect responses from justices and judges that were active and serving on the bench as of December 31, 2022. 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, 2022.

2. "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.

3. Since the selection of more than one response alternative is possible for the question pertaining to gender identity/sexual orientation, total responses to this question may be greater than the sum of justices and judges responding to the survey in a given year.

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Gender
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Court	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	**4**	**57.1%**	**3**	**42.9%**	**7**	**100.0%**
Court of Appeal	**37**	**42.0%**	**51**	**58.0%**	**88**	**100.0%**
First District	8	44.4%	10	55.6%	18	100.0%
Second District	12	48.0%	13	52.0%	25	100.0%
Third District	4	44.4%	5	55.6%	9	100.0%
Fourth District	7	35.0%	13	65.0%	20	100.0%
Fifth District	1	11.1%	8	88.9%	9	100.0%
Sixth District	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	7	100.0%
Trial Court	**635**	**39.7%**	**963**	**60.3%**	**1,598**	**100.0%**
Alameda	27	39.1%	42	60.9%	69	100.0%
Alpine	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	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%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Colusa	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Contra Costa	20	58.8%	14	41.2%	34	100.0%
Del Norte	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	6	100.0%
Fresno	18	43.9%	23	56.1%	41	100.0%

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Gender
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Court	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%
Glen	1	*50.0%*	1	*50.0%*	2	*100.0%*
Humboldt	2	*33.3%*	4	*66.7%*	6	*100.0%*
Imperial	2	*20.0%*	8	*80.0%*	10	*100.0%*
Inyo	0	*0.0%*	1	*100.0%*	1	*100.0%*
Kern	12	*38.7%*	19	*61.3%*	31	*100.0%*
Kings	4	*57.1%*	3	*42.9%*	7	*100.0%*
Lake	1	*25.0%*	3	*75.0%*	4	*100.0%*
Lassen	0	*0.0%*	2	*100.0%*	2	*100.0%*
Los Angeles	191	*39.9%*	288	*60.1%*	479	*100.0%*
Madera	2	*33.3%*	4	*66.7%*	6	*100.0%*
Marin	6	*46.2%*	7	*53.8%*	13	*100.0%*
Mariposa	1	*50.0%*	1	*50.0%*	2	*100.0%*
Mendocino	5	*71.4%*	2	*28.6%*	7	*100.0%*
Merced	4	*40.0%*	6	*60.0%*	10	*100.0%*
Modoc	1	*50.0%*	1	*50.0%*	2	*100.0%*
Mono	0	*0.0%*	2	*100.0%*	2	*100.0%*
Monterey	8	*50.0%*	8	*50.0%*	16	*100.0%*
Napa	4	*57.1%*	3	*42.9%*	7	*100.0%*
Nevada	2	*50.0%*	2	*50.0%*	4	*100.0%*
Orange	39	*35.1%*	72	*64.9%*	111	*100.0%*
Placer	4	*36.4%*	7	*63.6%*	11	*100.0%*
Plumas	1	*50.0%*	1	*50.0%*	2	*100.0%*
Riverside	22	*32.8%*	45	*67.2%*	67	*100.0%*
Sacramento	17	*30.4%*	39	*69.6%*	56	*100.0%*
San Benito	0	*0.0%*	1	*100.0%*	1	*100.0%*

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Gender
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Court	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%
San Bernardino	21	*30.9%*	47	*69.1%*	68	*100.0%*
San Diego	53	*39.8%*	80	*60.2%*	133	*100.0%*
San Francisco	21	*42.0%*	29	*58.0%*	50	*100.0%*
San Joaquin	10	*35.7%*	18	*64.3%*	28	*100.0%*
San Luis Obispo	5	*62.5%*	3	*37.5%*	8	*100.0%*
San Mateo	14	*53.8%*	12	*46.2%*	26	*100.0%*
Santa Barbara	8	*36.4%*	14	*63.6%*	22	*100.0%*
Santa Clara	36	*50.0%*	36	*50.0%*	72	*100.0%*
Santa Cruz	4	*36.4%*	7	*63.6%*	11	*100.0%*
Shasta	4	*44.4%*	5	*55.6%*	9	*100.0%*
Sierra	1	*50.0%*	1	*50.0%*	2	*100.0%*
Siskiyou	2	*50.0%*	2	*50.0%*	4	*100.0%*
Solano	9	*47.4%*	10	*52.6%*	19	*100.0%*
Sonoma	6	*37.5%*	10	*62.5%*	16	*100.0%*
Stanislaus	8	*34.8%*	15	*65.2%*	23	*100.0%*
Sutter	2	*40.0%*	3	*60.0%*	5	*100.0%*
Tehama	1	*25.0%*	3	*75.0%*	4	*100.0%*
Trinity	0	*0.0%*	1	*100.0%*	1	*100.0%*
Tulare	7	*35.0%*	13	*65.0%*	20	*100.0%*
Tuolumne	2	*50.0%*	2	*50.0%*	4	*100.0%*
Ventura	10	*37.0%*	17	*63.0%*	27	*100.0%*
Yolo	2	*18.2%*	9	*81.8%*	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, 2022. 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, 2022.

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Race/Ethnicity
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Race/Ethnicity[2] 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[3]		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided[4]		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	0	0.0%	5	5.7%	8	9.1%	8	9.1%	0	0.0%	62	70.5%	2	2.3%	3	3.4%	0	0.0%	88	100.0%
First District	0	0.0%	2	11.1%	2	11.1%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	12	66.7%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Second District	0	0.0%	2	8.0%	2	8.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	19	76.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	25	100.0%
Third District	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	1	11.1%	0	0.0%	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Fourth District	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%	14	70.0%	0	0.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	20	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	7	0.4%	151	9.4%	136	8.5%	202	12.6%	6	0.4%	976	61.1%	16	1.0%	72	4.5%	32	2.0%	1,598	100.0%
Alameda	0	0.0%	9	13.0%	11	15.9%	6	8.7%	0	0.0%	35	50.7%	0	0.0%	8	11.6%	0	0.0%	69	100.0%
Alpine	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%
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%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Colusa	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%
Contra Costa	0	0.0%	4	11.8%	3	8.8%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	25	73.5%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	34	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%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Fresno	1	2.4%	2	4.9%	4	9.8%	8	19.5%	0	0.0%	24	58.5%	1	2.4%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	41	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%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	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	3.2%	1	3.2%	4	12.9%	1	3.2%	24	77.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	31	100.0%

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Race/Ethnicity
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Race/Ethnicity[2] 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[3]		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided[4]		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kings	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	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%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Los Angeles	2	0.4%	61	12.7%	59	12.3%	81	16.9%	2	0.4%	233	48.6%	7	1.5%	21	4.4%	13	2.7%	479	100.0%
Madera	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	66.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Marin	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	10	76.9%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	13	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%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	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%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mono	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%
Monterey	0	0.0%	2	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	11	68.8%	0	0.0%	2	12.5%	0	0.0%	16	100.0%
Napa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Nevada	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%
Orange	0	0.0%	8	7.2%	7	6.3%	12	10.8%	0	0.0%	75	67.6%	1	0.9%	5	4.5%	3	2.7%	111	100.0%
Placer	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	7	63.6%	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%	4	6.0%	7	10.4%	9	13.4%	0	0.0%	42	62.7%	0	0.0%	5	7.5%	0	0.0%	67	100.0%
Sacramento	0	0.0%	8	14.3%	2	3.6%	4	7.1%	0	0.0%	36	64.3%	1	1.8%	3	5.4%	2	3.6%	56	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%	5	7.4%	8	11.8%	10	14.7%	1	1.5%	40	58.8%	1	1.5%	3	4.4%	0	0.0%	68	100.0%
San Diego	1	0.8%	7	5.3%	12	9.0%	19	14.3%	0	0.0%	80	60.2%	3	2.3%	3	2.3%	8	6.0%	133	100.0%
San Francisco	0	0.0%	12	24.0%	4	8.0%	7	14.0%	0	0.0%	27	54.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	50	100.0%
San Joaquin	0	0.0%	2	7.1%	3	10.7%	4	14.3%	0	0.0%	19	67.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	28	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Race/Ethnicity
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Race/Ethnicity[2] 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[3]		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided[4]		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
San Mateo	0	0.0%	2	7.7%	4	15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	18	69.2%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	26	100.0%
Santa Barbara	0	0.0%	1	4.5%	1	4.5%	4	18.2%	0	0.0%	16	72.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	22	100.0%
Santa Clara	0	0.0%	12	16.7%	2	2.8%	9	12.5%	2	2.8%	40	55.6%	0	0.0%	4	5.6%	3	4.2%	72	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%	9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%
Sierra	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%
Siskiyou	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%
Solano	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	4	21.1%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	10	52.6%	0	0.0%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	19	100.0%
Sonoma	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	12.5%	0	0.0%	13	81.3%	0	0.0%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	16	100.0%
Stanislaus	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	2	8.7%	2	8.7%	0	0.0%	17	73.9%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%
Sutter	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%
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	5.0%	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	15	75.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%	20	100.0%
Tuolumne	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	11.1%	0	0.0%	22	81.5%	0	0.0%	1	3.7%	1	3.7%	27	100.0%
Yolo	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	10	90.9%	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, 2022. 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, 2022.

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 23 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.

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Responses with Two or More Races
(Gov. Code; § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

	Total Number of Responding Justices/Judges	Responses with Two or More Races	
		Number	Percent
Supreme Court	7	1	*14.3%*
Asian; Pacific Islander		1	
Court of Appeal			
Second District	25	1	*4.0%*
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Fourth District	20	2	*10.0%*
Black; Hispanic		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Trial Court			
Alameda	69	7	*10.1%*
Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino		2	
Black or African American; White		3	
Hispanic or Latino; White		2	
Contra Costa	34	1	*2.9%*
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Fresno	41	2	*4.9%*
Hispanic or Latino; White		2	
Imperial	10	1	*10.0%*
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
Los Angeles	479	22	4.6%
Asian; Other Race		1	
Asian; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Asian; Pacific Islander		2	
Asian; White		3	
Black or African American, White		2	
Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		8	
Hispanic or Latino; White; Some Other Race		1	
White; Some Other Race		3	

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Responses with Two or More Races
(Gov. Code; § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

	Total Number of Responding Justices/Judges	Responses with Two or More Races	
		Number	Percent
Trial Court			
Marin	13	1	*7.7%*
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Mariposa	2	1	*50.0%*
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Mendocino	7	1	*14.3%*
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
Monterey	16	2	*12.5%*
Black or African American; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Orange	111	6	*5.4%*
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		4	
Asian; Hispanic or Some Other Race		1	
Placer	11	1	*9.1%*
Asian; White		1	
Riverside	67	5	*7.5%*
American Indian or Alaska Native; White		1	
Asian; White		1	
Black or African American; Latino		1	
Black or African American; White		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Sacramento	56	3	*5.4%*
Asian; Black or African American		1	
Black or African American; White		1	
Pacific Islander; White		1	
San Bernardino	68	3	*4.4%*
American Indian or Alaska Native; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Asian; Pacific Islander; White		1	
Black or African American; White		1	

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Responses with Two or More Races
(Gov. Code; § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

	Total Number of Responding Justices/Judges	Responses with Two or More Races	
		Number	Percent
Trial Court			
San Diego	133	3	*2.3%*
American Indian or Alaska Native; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	
White; Some Other Race		1	
San Mateo	26	1	*3.8%*
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Santa Clara	72	6	*8.3%*
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		2	
American Indian or Alaska Native; Some Other Race		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
White; Some Other Race		2	
Santa Cruz	11	2	*18.2%*
Hispanic or Latino; White		2	
Sonoma	16	1	*6.3%*
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Stanislaus	23	1	*4.3%*
Asian; Hispanic or Latino		1	
Tulare	20	3	*15.0%*
American Indian or Alaskan Native ; Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Black or African American; White		1	
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	
Ventura	27	1	*3.7%*
Hispanic or Latino; White		1	

1. The data reflect responses from courts where one or more judicial officers have indicated that their race/ethnic backgrounds include multiple groups. Only those justices and judges that are active as of December 31, 2022 are included. The tables do not include justices that were appointed but not yet confirmed, nor judges that were appointed but had not yet taken their oaths of office as of December 31, 2022.

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation

Courts	Heterosexual		Lesbian		Gay		Bisexual		Transgender		Information Not Provided[2]		Total Respondents[3]	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal	73	83.0%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	13	14.8%	88	100.0%
First District	15	83.3%	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	11.1%	18	100.0%
Second District	24	96.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%	25	100.0%
Third District	8	88.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	9	100.0%
Fourth District	13	65.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	30.0%	20	100.0%
Fifth District	7	77.8%	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%	1	14.3%	7	100.0%
Trial Court	1,198	75.0%	29	1.8%	42	2.6%	4	0.3%	2	0.1%	323	20.2%	1,598	100.0%
Alameda	50	72.5%	5	7.2%	4	5.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	9	13.0%	69	100.0%
Alpine	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Amador	2	100.0%	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%	2	18.2%	11	100.0%
Calaveras	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Colusa	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Contra Costa	28	82.4%	1	2.9%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	11.8%	34	100.0%
Del Norte	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
El Dorado	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Fresno	30	73.2%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	24.4%	41	100.0%
Glenn	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Humboldt	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
Imperial	7	70.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	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%	1	100.0%
Kern	24	77.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	22.6%	31	100.0%

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation

Courts	Heterosexual		Lesbian		Gay		Bisexual		Transgender		Information Not Provided[2]		Total Respondents[3]	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kings	5	71.4%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7	100.0%
Lake	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Lassen	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%
Los Angeles	346	72.2%	7	1.5%	19	4.0%	2	0.4%	0	0.0%	105	21.9%	479	100.0%
Madera	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	6	100.0%
Marin	12	92.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.7%	13	100.0%
Mariposa	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mendocino	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	7	100.0%
Merced	10	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	100.0%
Modoc	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Mono	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Monterey	14	87.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	12.5%	16	100.0%
Napa	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Nevada	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	50.0%	4	100.0%
Orange	81	73.0%	1	0.9%	2	1.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	27	24.3%	111	100.0%
Placer	8	72.7%	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%	2	100.0%
Riverside	52	77.6%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14	20.9%	67	100.0%
Sacramento	39	69.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	15	26.8%	56	100.0%
San Benito	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
San Bernardino	55	80.9%	2	2.9%	1	1.5%	1	1.5%	0	0.0%	9	13.2%	68	100.0%
San Diego	92	69.2%	2	1.5%	7	5.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	32	24.1%	133	100.0%
San Francisco	35	70.0%	2	4.0%	4	8.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	18.0%	50	100.0%
San Joaquin	19	67.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	0	0.0%	8	28.6%	28	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%
San Mateo	21	80.8%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	11.5%	26	100.0%
Santa Barbara	20	90.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	9.1%	22	100.0%
Santa Clara	49	68.1%	3	4.2%	1	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	26.4%	72	100.0%
Santa Cruz	9	81.8%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	11	100.0%
Shasta	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	9	100.0%

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Gender Identity/Sexual Orientation
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Gender Identity / Sexual Orientation

Courts	Heterosexual		Lesbian		Gay		Bisexual		Transgender		Information Not Provided[2]		Total Respondents[3]	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sierra	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%
Siskiyou	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%
Solano	14	73.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	26.3%	19	100.0%
Sonoma	13	81.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	18.8%	16	100.0%
Stanislaus	21	91.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	8.7%	23	100.0%
Sutter	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	60.0%	5	100.0%
Tehama	3	75.0%	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%	1	100.0%
Tulare	17	85.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.0%	20	100.0%
Tuolumne	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%	4	100.0%
Ventura	20	74.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	25.9%	27	100.0%
Yolo	10	90.9%	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%	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, 2022. 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, 2022.

2. "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.

3. Since the selection of more than one response alternative is possible for the question pertaining to gender identity/sexual orientation, total responses to this question may be greater than the sum of judicial officers responding to the survey in a given year.

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Responding Justices and Judges
Relative to Veteran and Disability Status
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022

Court	Veteran[1]						Disabled[1]					
	No		Yes		Total Respondents		No		Yes		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court	**4**	**100%**	**0**	**0%**	**4**	**100%**	**4**	**100%**	**0**	**0%**	**4**	**100%**
Court of Appeal	**42**	**93%**	**3**	**7%**	**45**	**100%**	**44**	**98%**	**1**	**2%**	**45**	**100%**
First District	12	100%	0	0%	12	100%	12	100%	0	0%	12	100%
Second District	13	93%	1	7%	14	100%	13	93%	1	7%	14	100%
Third District	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Fourth District	7	87%	1	13%	8	100%	8	100%	0	0%	8	100%
Fifth District	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%
Sixth District	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Trial Court	**779**	**94%**	**52**	**6%**	**831**	**100%**	**815**	**98%**	**19**	**2%**	**834**	**100%**
Alameda	34	94%	2	6%	36	100%	35	97%	1	3%	36	100%
Alpine	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Amador	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Butte	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%
Calaveras	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Contra Costa	16	84%	3	16%	19	100%	17	89%	2	11%	19	100%
Del Norte	1	50%	1	50%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
El Dorado	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Fresno	19	100%	0	0%	19	100%	19	100%	0	0%	19	100%
Glenn	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%

Demographic Data Provided by Responding Justices and Judges
Relative to Veteran and Disability Status
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022

Court	Veteran[1]						Disabled[1]					
	No		Yes		Total Respondents		No		Yes		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	*%*	N	*%*	N	*%*	N	*%*	N	*%*	N	*%*
Humboldt	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*
Imperial	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*
Inyo	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*
Kern	14	*93%*	1	*7%*	15	*100%*	15	*100%*	0	*0%*	15	*100%*
Kings	3	*75%*	1	*25%*	4	*100%*	4	*100%*	0	*0%*	4	*100%*
Lake	2	*100%*	0	*0%*	2	*100%*	2	*100%*	0	*0%*	2	*100%*
Lassen	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*
Los Angeles	230	*94%*	14	*6%*	244	*100%*	240	*98%*	5	*2%*	245	*100%*
Madera	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*
Marin	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*
Mariposa	2	*100%*	0	*0%*	2	*100%*	2	*100%*	0	*0%*	2	*100%*
Mendocino	3	*100%*	0	*0%*	3	*100%*	3	*100%*	0	*0%*	3	*100%*
Merced	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*
Modoc	0	*0%*	1	*100%*	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*	1	*100%*
Monterey	7	*100%*	0	*0%*	7	*100%*	7	*100%*	0	*0%*	7	*100%*
Napa	5	*100%*	0	*0%*	5	*100%*	4	*80%*	1	*20%*	5	*100%*
Nevada	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*
Orange	53	*95%*	3	*5%*	56	*100%*	53	*95%*	3	*5%*	56	*100%*
Placer	2	*50%*	2	*50%*	4	*100%*	4	*100%*	0	*0%*	4	*100%*
Plumas	0	*0%*	0	*0%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*	0	*0%*	1	*100%*

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Responding Justices and Judges
Relative to Veteran and Disability Status
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022

Court	Veteran[1]						Disabled[1]					
	No		Yes		Total Respondents		No		Yes		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Riverside	42	100%	0	0%	42	100%	42	100%	0	0%	42	100%
Sacramento	24	89%	3	11%	27	100%	26	96%	1	4%	27	100%
San Benito	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
San Bernardino	34	92%	3	8%	37	100%	36	97%	1	3%	37	100%
San Diego	69	93%	5	7%	74	100%	72	97%	2	3%	74	100%
San Francisco	24	96%	1	4%	25	100%	25	100%	0	0%	25	100%
San Joaquin	12	100%	0	0%	12	100%	12	100%	0	0%	12	100%
San Luis Obispo	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%
San Mateo	14	93%	1	7%	15	100%	15	100%	0	0%	15	100%
Santa Barbara	8	89%	1	11%	9	100%	9	100%	0	0%	9	100%
Santa Clara	36	97%	1	3%	37	100%	38	100%	0	0%	38	100%
Santa Cruz	6	86%	1	14%	7	100%	7	100%	0	0%	7	100%
Shasta	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%	5	100%	0	0%	5	100%
Sierra	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Siskiyou	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%	0	0%	4	100%
Solano	10	91%	1	9%	11	100%	11	100%	0	0%	11	100%
Sonoma	11	85%	2	15%	13	100%	12	100%	0	0%	12	100%
Stanislaus	11	85%	2	15%	13	100%	13	93%	1	7%	14	100%
Sutter	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Tehama	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Responding Justices and Judges
Relative to Veteran and Disability Status
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022

Court	Veteran[1]						Disabled[1]					
	No		Yes		Total Respondents		No		Yes		Total Respondents	
Trial Court	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Trinity	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
Tulare	9	100%	0	0%	9	100%	9	100%	0	0%	9	100%
Tuolumne	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
Ventura	10	91%	1	9%	11	100%	12	100%	0	0%	12	100%
Yolo	6	86%	1	14%	7	100%	7	100%	0	0%	7	100%
Yuba	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%	3	100%	0	0%	3	100%

1. Tabled values for veteran and disability status include responses from justices and judges new to the bench in calendar years 2014 through 2022, as well as experienced justices and judges who chose to update their demographic information during the same 8 year period. Demographic questions pertaining to veteran status 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.

Judicial Council of California

Year-to-Year Comparison of Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Gender
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022[1]

Gender

Court / Year	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court						
2014	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
2015	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%
2016	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
2017	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
2018	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%
2019	3	50.0%	3	50.0%	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	50.0%	3	50.0%	6	100.0%
2023	4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal						
2014	29	30.5%	66	69.5%	95	100.0%
2015	31	31.6%	67	68.4%	98	100.0%
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	42.0%	51	58.0%	88	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, 2022[1]

Gender

Court / Year	Female		Male		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Trial Court						
2014	508	32.2%	1,071	67.8%	1,579	100.0%
2015	499	32.2%	1,052	67.8%	1,551	100.0%
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%
Total						
2014	**541**	**32.2%**	**1,140**	**67.8%**	**1,681**	**100.0%**
2015	**533**	**32.2%**	**1,122**	**67.8%**	**1,655**	**100.0%**
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%**

1. The calendar years in which the demographic data was released may be found in the first column of the table. The 2013 through 2023 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.

Judicial Council of California

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, 2022[1]

Race/Ethnicity[2] 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[3]		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided[4]		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Supreme Court																				
2014	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2015	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
2016	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2017	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2018	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
2019	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
2020	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2021	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
2022	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%
2023	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%
Court of Appeal																				
2014	0	0.0%	2	2.1%	5	5.3%	5	5.3%	0	0.0%	75	78.9%	1	1.1%	6	6.3%	1	1.1%	95	100.0%
2015	0	0.0%	1	1.0%	7	7.1%	6	6.1%	0	0.0%	75	76.5%	1	1.0%	7	7.1%	1	1.1%	98	100.0%
2016	0	0.0%	2	2.1%	8	8.2%	6	6.2%	0	0.0%	73	75.3%	1	1.0%	6	6.2%	1	1.0%	97	100.0%
2017	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	9	9.7%	5	5.4%	0	0.0%	71	76.3%	1	1.1%	5	5.4%	0	1.0%	93	100.0%
2018	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	10	11.1%	6	6.7%	0	0.0%	65	72.2%	2	2.2%	5	5.6%	0	0.0%	90	100.0%
2019	0	0.0%	5	4.8%	10	9.6%	7	6.7%	0	0.0%	75	72.1%	2	1.9%	5	4.8%	0	0.0%	104	100.0%
2020	0	0.0%	6	5.9%	9	8.8%	6	5.9%	0	0.0%	75	73.5%	2	2.0%	4	3.9%	0	0.0%	102	100.0%
2021	0	0.0%	5	5.1%	10	10.1%	6	6.1%	0	0.0%	72	72.7%	2	2.0%	4	4.0%	0	0.0%	99	100.0%
2022	0	0.0%	5	5.3%	11	11.7%	7	7.4%	0	0.0%	66	70.2%	2	2.1%	3	3.2%	0	0.0%	94	100.0%
2023	0	0.0%	5	5.7%	8	9.1%	8	9.1%	0	0.0%	62	70.5%	2	2.3%	3	3.4%	0	0.0%	88	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, 2022[1]

Race/Ethnicity[2] 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[3]		More Than One Race		Information Not Provided[4]		Total Respondents	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Trial Court																				
2014	8	0.5%	95	6.0%	99	6.3%	148	9.4%	4	0.3%	1,108	70.2%	18	1.1%	52	3.3%	47	3.0%	1,579	100.0%
2015	8	0.5%	97	6.3%	101	6.5%	149	9.6%	4	0.3%	1,079	69.6%	18	1.2%	50	3.2%	45	2.9%	1,551	100.0%
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	1.0%	52	3.3%	42	2.7%	1,584	100.0%
2018	9	0.6%	116	7.3%	111	7.0%	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	1.0%	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	1.0%	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	12.0%	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	1.0%	72	4.5%	32	2.0%	1,598	100.0%
Total																				
2014	8	0.5%	99	5.9%	104	6.2%	153	9.1%	4	0.2%	1,186	70.6%	19	1.1%	60	3.6%	48	2.9%	1,681	100.0%
2015	8	0.5%	100	6.0%	108	6.5%	155	9.4%	4	0.2%	1,157	69.9%	19	1.1%	58	3.5%	46	2.8%	1,655	100.0%
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	10.0%	4	0.2%	1,159	68.8%	17	1.0%	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	1.0%	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	1.0%	72	4.2%	34	2.0%	1,732	100.0%
2021	7	0.4%	138	8.1%	137	8.0%	191	11.2%	5	0.3%	1,104	64.8%	17	1.0%	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	1.0%	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%

1. The calendar years in which the demographic data was released may be found in the first column of the table. The 2013 through 2023 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 23 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.

Judicial Council of California

Demographic Data Provided by Justices and Judges
Relative to Race/Ethnicity
(Gov. Code, § 12011.5(n))
As of December 31, 2022

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.